

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) for the relief of James Birney, alias James Brady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) for the relief of Henry C. Romaine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5416) granting an increase of pension to William J. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) granting a pension to John Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

334. By Mr. APPLEBY: Petition of citizens of towns of New Jersey, praying for the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

335. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of Jacob Ruppert, president, and the Peter Doelger Brewing Co., of New York, urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

336. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petitions of John T. Connor Co., Jays (Inc.), and F. C. Henderson Co., all of Boston, Mass., relative to the sales tax; also, petitions of the Perry Buxton Doane Co., Lockwood, Brackett & Co., and Schmitz & Guild (Inc.), all of Boston, Mass., relative to proposed duty on certain commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

337. By Mr. KISSELL: Petition of Obermayer & Liebman, New York, urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

338. By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of 38 citizens of South Milwaukee, urging amendment of prohibition enforcement law to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

339. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Local No. 76, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, urging the adoption of a protective tariff on pottery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

340. Also, petition of the East Buffalo New York Brewing Co., Buffalo, N. Y., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

341. By Mr. MAGEE: Petitions of the George Zett Brewery and Bartels Brewery Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., in favor of repeal of internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

342. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the American Association of Mexico, New York City, relative to the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

343. By Mr. RAKER: Resolution of the Claremont Chapter, Claremont, Los Angeles County, Calif., Daughters of the American Revolution, urging support of a bill known as the Daughters of the American Revolution old trails act; to the Committee on Roads.

344. Also, petition of Mrs. Bertha Seimears, of Glendora, Calif., protesting against the Fess-Capper educational bill and all other physical education bills; to the Committee on Education.

345. Also, letter from the Music Trades Association of Southern California, urging the repeal of the excise tax on the major part of the products used in the music trade; also, letter from the Hudson Bay Fur Co., of San Francisco, Calif., urging the repeal of the excise tax of 10 per cent imposed upon all articles manufactured by fur companies; also, letter from C. Richard Knapp, of Grass Valley, Calif., protesting against the present stamp tax on proprietary drugs and toilet preparations; also, resolution adopted by the Motor Car Dealers' Division of the Alameda County Automobile Trade Association, of Oakland, Calif., urging legislation to protect the automobile industry from the dumping of salvaged war equipment in this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

345½. Also, petition of Tuolumne Tribe, No. 247, Independent Order of Red Men, indorsing legislation for the enlargement of Federal arsenal at Benicia, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

346. Also, petition of George S. Tappan and others, of Pleasant Valley, via Placerville, Calif., urging that Congress grant amnesty with restored rights to all political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

346½. Also, nine resolutions adopted by the third annual international mining convention, assembled at Portland, Oreg., and by special convention of the United States delegates to such convention, relative to measures for the benefit of the mining industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

347. By Mr. RYAN: Petition of citizens of the thirteenth district, New York, praying for the recognition of the Irish republic, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

348. Also, petition of citizens of New York City, urging Congress to stop crime in Ireland and for the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

349. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Ruling Masters' Association of 1921, the Masonic lodges of Rochester, N. Y., indorsing and urging the introduction and passage of such measures as will remedy the present conditions in the care of our disabled soldiers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

350. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the Eagle Brewing Co., Utica, N. Y., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

351. By Mr. SPEAKS: Papers to accompany House bill 5318 for the relief of George W. Allison; to the Committee on Claims.

352. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of A. M. Eckstein, manager, Forbes, 1115 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against excise tax on the fur industry under title 9, subdivision 19, revenue law 1918, and supporting the adoption of a gross sales or turnover tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

353. Also, petition of First Lieut. Francis H. Smith, Reserve Corps, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring an increase in the appropriations allowing a reserve officer four months or longer active duty upon his request in lieu of 14 days; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

354. Also, petition of the New Castle Reading Circle, New Castle, Pa., protesting against the enactment of the Walsh bill having in view the damming of the Yellowstone Lake; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

355. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Austin North End Woman's Club, by Mrs. Ida E. Morey, Chicago, Ill., opposing House bill 345.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 28, 1921.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the revelation of Thyself in nature. So do the Heavens declare Thy glory and the firmament showeth Thy handiwork. But we thank Thee for the nearer and more precious revelation in the person of Thy Son and His work, and pray that our hearts may be always conscious of His infinite nearness, His helpfulness, His sufficiency in all our needs, our perplexities and responsibilities. We humbly ask in His Name. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CORRECTION—TREATMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to make a correction.

On yesterday, in the course of a very interesting discussion by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] of the serious conditions existing in some of the public hospitals, I used this language:

I agree with him—

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]—

that there ought to be this investigation, but we have connected with the Army an inspection service as well as the Public Health Service, and it would seem to me that there has been serious neglect not only on the part of the Health Service but on the part of the inspection service.

I have been informed by Maj. Gen. John L. Chamberlain, who is the Inspector General of the Army, that they have no connection whatever with the Public Health Service, and therefore would have no jurisdiction. My statement necessarily involved that department somewhat, and I am sorry that the mistake was made. I think this correction is due to the Inspector General's service.

PRODUCTION, MILLING, AND MARKETING OF RICE.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, some days ago I introduced a resolution (S. Res. 56) providing for an investigation of conditions, surrounding the production and marketing of agricultural products, particularly rice. This morning I have

received a telegram from a national bank in eastern Arkansas which makes an astonishing statement in connection with the subject matter of that resolution. The telegram is as follows:

(Telegram.)

COTTON PLANT, ARK., April 28, 1921—9 a. m.

Senator JOE T. ROBINSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Rice growers of this county (Hunt district), and our customers, report that Wheatley rice mill has sold all of farmers' rice in storage for storage and milling charges without previous notice, and request investigation.

THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK.

I have no knowledge except the telegram itself respecting the facts stated in the telegram. It confirms the statement that I made in the Senate on last Monday when I introduced the resolution referred to.

According to the telegram the entire crop of rice owned by the farmers who have stored the rice in this mill has been sold without notice to the farmers for the payment of storage and milling charges. If this is true—and I again say that I have no knowledge as to its truthfulness except the statement in the telegram, and I believe it to be true—if this is true the crop of the farmers has been, in effect, confiscated without notice to them. The telegram shows the urgent necessity for the investigation which I am seeking to procure through the resolution which I submitted.

I ask that the telegram be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to accompany the resolution to which it relates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the telegram will be so referred.

Mr. NORRIS. The particular resolution which the Senator from Arkansas has mentioned has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. ROBINSON. It has.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall be very glad to see the Senator from Arkansas and try to arrange for hearings at a very early date, if he desires to have such a course taken.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the Senator. I shall be very glad to have a hearing at the earliest date possible, and to have favorable action taken in respect to the resolution if the committee thinks that may be done.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4810) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2185) providing for a "Pageant of Progress Exposition" cancellation stamp, to be used by the Chicago post office, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILLIS. I present a memorial recently adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The memorial was read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 24.

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to eliminate dual telephone service.

Whereas the public interest demands the elimination of dual telephone service and the unification of the service of competing telephone companies; and

Whereas such unification of telephone service, in justice to the stockholders of the existing telephone companies, can only be secured by a consolidation of said competing companies or a purchase by one company of the property of the other; and

Whereas such consolidation is now authorized by the laws of the State of Ohio, but there seems to be a doubt whether such consolidation or purchase is permissible under Federal law: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to enact such laws or amendments to existing law as will permit competing telephone companies doing either intrastate or interstate telephone business to unify the service rendered by such companies either by a purchase and sale of the property of one company by the other or by a consolidation or merger of said companies, when the same is authorized by the laws of the State in which such properties are situated; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the senate to the United States Senators and Members of Congress representing the State of Ohio.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 24, Mr. De Weese, as adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Eighty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

S. E. HALLEY,
Clerk of Senate.

Mr. LODGE presented a telegram in the nature of a resolution of the Foreign Policy Association, of Boston, Mass., favoring a reduction of armaments, the convening of a naval conference with Great Britain and Japan for a discussion of the limitation of naval armaments, the abandonment of the 1916 program for increasing the Navy by 156 ships, cooperation of the United States with the armament commission of the League of Nations, so as to effect a general limitation of armaments, and to take part in any general international conference which may be summoned for the purpose of reducing or limiting armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KEYES presented a memorial of Concord Lodge, No. 537, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Concord, N. H., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation repealing the excess-profits tax and the substitution of a sales or turnover tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Bird City, Kans., remonstrating against the repeal of the Volstead Prohibition Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Elbow Local, No. 1786, Farmers' Union, of Manhattan, Kans., remonstrating against the repeal of the excess profits tax law and substituting therefor a sales or turnover tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 934) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1921, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS IN THE NAVY.

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 656) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 6) thereon.

BRIDGE AT PEMBINA, N. DAK.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably with an amendment, from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 82) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon. It is the regular bridge bill, granting the consent of Congress for the building of a bridge, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment was to strike out section 1 of the bill and to insert in lieu thereof:

That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto authorized by the act of Congress approved June 5, 1920, to be constructed by the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., across the Red River of the North at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak."

CONTINGENT FUND RESOLUTION.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably five resolutions. The first one is the regular resolution authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia to hold hearings and employ a reporter. The second one authorizes the Committee on Privileges and Elections to hold hearings and employ a reporter. The third is to authorize the Committee on Finance to do likewise. The resolution is reported with an amendment permitting the Committee on Commerce to employ a temporary clerk, and another one permits the Committee on Military Affairs to employ a clerk during the present session of Congress. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the consideration of each of the resolutions separately. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think I have an objection, but I should like to have the resolutions read and the question taken on each resolution as it is proposed.

Mr. CALDER. Very well.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 54, submitted by Mr. BALL on the 20th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 55, submitted by Mr. DILLINGHAM on the 25th instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during sessions or recesses of the Senate.

ASSISTANT CLERK OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably with an amendment from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate resolution 39, submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] on the 13th instant, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate by unanimous consent proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was, in line 2, to strike out "\$2,000" and in lieu to substitute "\$1,800," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, during the present session of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is that for a new clerk for the committee, in addition to what it has had heretofore?

Mr. CALDER. It is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to have the chairman of the committee give some explanation as to why it is necessary to have an additional clerk.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I will state that at the last session of Congress the committee got along by having detailed for a short time one of the departmental clerks, on the special request of the committee. We found that the work of the committee simply could not be carried on with the help we had. It was almost an interminable job to answer the calls by telephone and the inquiries with reference to shipping and commercial matters, lighthouses, and all that sort of thing, and it took practically all the time of the clerk that we had available for the actual service of the committee. At my request the Department of Commerce detailed one of their employees for a while, but they could not let us have him all the time.

The committee is now confronted with quite a number of very important measures; hearings will have to be held; and it does not seem to be possible to keep up the work with the help we have had heretofore. I have refrained from asking for additional help because I wanted to keep expenses down as low as possible, but the condition confronting us is that the work which has to be carried on is of such importance that it ought to be carried on promptly, and we really need the additional clerk.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator will allow me to ask him, was the proposition submitted to the committee in session, and did it meet the approval of the minority members?

Mr. CALDER. The minority members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were not present, but I spoke to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] about it, and tried to find the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones], but could not locate him. The junior Senator from Tennessee directed me to report that he favored the adoption of the resolution, giving the salary reported.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I recognize the fact that it is poor economy for the committees of the Senate not to have a sufficient clerical force to attend to their business, and I have no desire to stand in the way of their having a sufficient clerical force if it is really necessary. But about two years ago we overhauled all the committee assignments and assignments to Senators and worked out a program which seemed to be satisfactory and which worked well during the last two years. I do not think that ought to be disturbed unless there is very good reason.

There are members of the Commerce Committee on my side of the Chamber here on the floor, and they know more about it than I do. If the Senator thinks it is absolutely necessary, I shall not object, but I hope in the future the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, if he has to report such a proposition, will have a full meeting of his committee, because it helps the floor leader on this side when he knows that the viewpoint of his own side has been reflected in the resolution.

Mr. CALDER. I know that is true, and I should like to have had the approval of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones]. I did have the approval of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], but I could not get into communication with the Senator from New Mexico. I advised him of the meeting, but for some reason he could not attend.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator from Alabama meant to inquire whether the resolution had been submitted to the minority members of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CALDER. I did submit it to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that it was I who introduced the resolution before the Committee on Commerce had held a regular meeting. It did not occur to me to submit the resolution to the committee, because I knew it had to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in order to be passed upon by that committee. If any member of the minority of the Committee on Commerce would like to have the matter wait until their wishes may be known, I should be very glad to have that done.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Simmons], who is an old member of the Committee on Commerce, knows far more about it than I do. I see he is on the floor, and I should like to have his judgment upon the matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I did not hear the proposition of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The proposition is to provide the Committee on Commerce with an additional clerk during the session.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has that matter been before the Committee on Commerce at all?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It has been before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but it has not been taken up by the Committee on Commerce. I will say to the Senator that possibly I should have presented the matter to the latter committee, but I did not think of doing so, as I knew the resolution would have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought possibly it had been before the Committee on Commerce at the meeting held this morning, which I was not able to attend, because the Finance Committee was holding an executive session in connection with the tariff bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It has not been taken up in the Committee on Commerce, but if the Senator thinks it should be considered by that committee, I will be very glad to ask that the resolution go over until the Committee on Commerce may consider it. I assumed that the condition in the committee had probably been brought to the attention of the chairman of the committee more particularly than to any other member of the committee. As I said a moment ago, I have withheld presenting the resolution, as I withheld it at the last session. At that time I was able to have an assistant detailed from the Commerce Department, but I do not think that an advisable thing to do.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have such confidence in the chairman of the committee that I myself would be content to accept his statement that he needs additional clerical help.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is very kind of the Senator. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that I think I was one of those who aided in the rearrangement of the clerks of various Senate committees and of Senators when we provided for the permanent establishment, but it was recognized at that time that contingencies might arise where one committee or another would have special work that would require additional help, and I think it was stated in debate that such contingencies could be taken care of when the showing was made that additional help was necessary. As I have said, I have withheld

asking for this additional assistance and have asked the regular clerks to work early and late in order to avoid calling for additional help, but the work has become so heavy that it is impossible to carry it on without some additional help during the session.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, this is rather a new proposition, because it was not presented to the committee, as the chairman of the committee has stated. I was not aware that the resolution was coming up. Of course, I know quite a good deal about the work of the Commerce Committee. When I was its chairman I felt that it ought to have had an assistant clerk. At that time we were investigating the Shipping Board operations and the committee was in almost continual session. We managed to get along, however, without additional assistance then, but now we have come to the point where we have to deal with a good many measures that have been referred to the committee which are very important, and the work of the committee is stupendous. I realize that, and I think there is real need for an additional assistant. As I understand, there is now one clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger for the committee. Is not that the situation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The chairman of the committee has four clerks for his own work and the work of the committee. Three of these clerks are employed early and late in the office in the Senate Office Building. There is one who has been trying to take care of the actual committee-room work. The purpose of this resolution is to furnish aid there, for only one man really has been doing the actual committee-room work.

Mr. FLETCHER. At one time I had to bring over a clerk from my other office to assist with the work in the committee room, and I realize that there is real need for assistance in that room. I myself hesitate to advocate these additions, because just that much more expense is thereby entailed; but, realizing the importance of the work before the Committee on Commerce, I am disposed to join with the chairman of the committee in the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment the resolution (S. Res. 53). I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 53) submitted by Mr. WADSWORTH on the 19th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an additional clerk at the rate of \$1,600 per annum, to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, during the first session of the Sixty-seventh Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think we should have an explanation of the matter.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, my colleague, who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, is not present, being out of the city temporarily, but he asked me to request that the resolution be considered.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Alabama that the resolution makes the same provision for an extra clerk that was made heretofore for the Committee on Military Affairs. As the Senator knows, the work of that committee has largely increased. While there used to be hundreds of nominations before that committee there are now thousands and thousands, and there are also numerous bills of all kinds in connection with the old Military Establishment and organizing it on the new basis, which are now referred to the committee. That, added to the fact that a Senator from the imperial State of New York has a great deal to do in connection with his personal matters, makes it impossible for the Senator from New York to get along with the number of clerks he now has without this extra man. I think therefore the additional assistance should be granted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand the Senator, there has been an extra clerk provided for that committee in the past?

Mr. WARREN. That is true.

Mr. CALDER. I may add that the additional clerk is for the session of Congress only.

Mr. WARREN. I should object to the provision being made if it were for any longer than the session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably with an amendment the resolution (S. Res. 22) submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] on the 12th instant, to provide for hearings before the Committee on Finance. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That the Committee on Finance or any subcommittees thereof be, and hereby is, authorized to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Sixty-seventh Congress at such times and places as they may deem advisable; to make investigations into internal revenue, customs, currency, and coinage matters, and other matters within its jurisdiction, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary; and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such expert, stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary; and all of the expenses of such committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee is authorized to order such printing and binding as may be necessary for its use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MAHONING RIVER BRIDGE, OHIO.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 407) granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 5) thereon. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and he is very anxious to have it passed to-day, if possible. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Trumbull Steel Co. and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, near the city of Warren, in the county of Trumbull, in the State of Ohio, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from New York whether the bill is in the usual form?

Mr. CALDER. It is in the usual form, and its passage is recommended by the War Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1296) to amend the act approved February 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide for the maintenance of the United States Section of the International High Commission"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1297) for the relief of George Van Derburgh Brown; and

A bill (S. 1298) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1299) preventing increases in rates, fares, charges, and classifications until approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 1300) for the relief of the heirs of Agnes Ingels, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1301) to increase the cost of the public building at Prescott, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1302) releasing the claim of the United States Government to the block or square of land in the city of Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, upon which is situated the old Federal jail, to the city of Fort Smith as a site for a convention hall, community building, and other public purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1303) for the relief of James Shook;

A bill (S. 1304) for the relief of Walter I. Whitty;

A bill (S. 1305) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Pine Bluff, Ark., two German cannons or field-pieces; and

A bill (S. 1306) for increasing the efficiency of Army bands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 1307) granting homesteads to soldiers, sailors, and marines, upon proof of 90 days' residence; and

A bill (S. 1308) granting to the State of New Mexico the even numbered sections of land in townships wherein odd numbered sections have heretofore been granted to the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad Co., in the counties of San Juan, Sandoval, McKinley, Bernalillo, Valencia, and Socorro; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1309) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Gallup, N. Mex.;

A bill (S. 1310) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Socorro, N. Mex.; and

A bill (S. 1311) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 1312) to amend the charter of the Potomac Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 1313) to amend section 407 of the transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 1314) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Gen. George L. Beal; and

A bill (S. 1315) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William L. Ross (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 1316) granting an increase of pension to William Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 1317) to consolidate the offices of register and receiver at the land office at Alliance, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 1318) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue interchangeable mileage books of not less than 1,000 nor more than 5,000 miles, and at a reduction of 33½ per cent from the established rate; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 1319) for the relief of Henry Jones Ford; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1320) to amend section 13 of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1321) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hendrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 1322) to establish an additional fish-cultural station in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1323) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Crockett County, State of Tennessee, one German cannon, with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1324) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at South Pittsburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1325) granting a pension to Robert J. Carter;

A bill (S. 1326) granting a pension to Alvin Rainbolt;

A bill (S. 1327) granting a pension to John Gentry;

A bill (S. 1328) granting an increase of pension to Erastus A. Kelly;

A bill (S. 1329) granting a pension to John Collins;

A bill (S. 1330) granting a pension to Alvin W. Smith;

A bill (S. 1331) granting a pension to W. D. Davis;

A bill (S. 1332) granting a pension to Edward B. Earl;

A bill (S. 1333) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hopper;

A bill (S. 1334) granting a pension to Louisa Brown;

A bill (S. 1335) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Wright;

A bill (S. 1336) granting a pension to William R. Phillips;

A bill (S. 1337) granting an increase of pension to Ruth S. Gleaves;

A bill (S. 1338) granting an increase of pension to William Harris;

A bill (S. 1339) granting a pension to Zack Amis; and

A bill (S. 1340) granting a pension to John K. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 1341) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Frank T. Foster; and

A bill (S. 1342) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Omer H. Porter, George F. Porter, Annie Porter Mason, Edward B. Porter, and Albert B. Porter, heirs at law of Albert G. Porter, deceased, the Union Trust Co. of Indianapolis, executor of Benjamin Harrison, deceased, and Mary L. Fishback, sole legatee of William P. Fishback, deceased (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1343) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment authorizing the appointment of Capt. William R. Rush a rear admiral on the active list of the United States Navy, to take rank immediately after Rear Admiral Albert Gleaves, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO MATERNITY AND INFANCY BILL.

Mr. MOSES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1039) for the public protection of maternity and infancy and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

ROWENA S. BUMPHREY.

Mr. TOWNSEND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 58), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate to Rowena S. Bumphrey, widow of Marvin H. Bumphrey, late a messenger in the employ of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TREATMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read. As it involves expense, I suppose it must be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I should like to request that that committee act on the resolution as speedily as possible, as I believe it is very important.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators, three from the majority party and two from the minority party, be appointed by the President of the Senate to investigate all bureaus and agencies of the Government dealing with the care, treatment, insuring, compensating, rehabilitating, and hospitalizing of the veterans of the World War.

That said committee shall investigate specifically the manner, methods, and scope of the activities of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the United States Public Health Service, and the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

That said committee so appointed shall be authorized to select its own chairman, to send for persons and papers, to visit such places and institutions as it may deem necessary, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer or stenographers to report such hearings as may be held in connection with such investigation at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page.

That said committee may sit during the sessions and recesses of the Senate, and it shall report its findings and make recommendations for such amendments and changes in existing laws as it may deem necessary for the welfare of ex-service men and their dependents to the Senate at the earliest possible date.

All expenses in connection herewith to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

THE MEN'S CLOTHING INDUSTRY.

Mr. MOSES. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 60) was read, as follows:

Whereas it is a matter of public knowledge that during the past five months the manufacture of men's clothing in the cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other cities has been seriously hampered and curtailed by strikes; and

Whereas the said men's clothing industry in the United States produces annually a product to the value of over \$500,000,000, the value of the product of the New York market alone being over \$200,000,000; and

Whereas it appears as the result of these industrial disturbances that the production has been limited to about 25 per cent of normal in these markets; and

Whereas these conditions constitute a vital factor in maintaining the high cost of clothing to the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor is hereby authorized and directed, through the full committee or through any subcommittee thereof, to investigate as speedily as possible the conditions in the clothing industry of the United States; the working conditions therein; the causes of industrial unrest in these industries, and its bearing upon the cost of clothing to the public; the purposes, objects, methods, and tactics of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and its relations, if any, with other political organizations and quasi-political groups, and to make a report to the Senate of such findings.

The said committee is hereby authorized to sit and act at such time and place as it may deem necessary, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses, the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ counsel, and stenographers at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer questions pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The expenses thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers ordered by the subcommittee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest to the members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate that if they really want to know where the greatest expense is in the distribution of men's clothing, they had better investigate the retailers. I am quite sure that that is where the greatest profit is made.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, this is not with a view of determining profiteering. This is with a view of determining production.

Mr. SMOOT. That would have a bearing upon the cost of goods, however.

Mr. MOSES. I have no objection to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate broadening the scope of the investigation if they desire.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is what I was going to suggest. I have not a doubt but that the profits that are made by the retailers of clothing sold in the United States are something that has been unheard of for years and years past.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4810) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PEACE WITH GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution in regard to peace with Germany.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and for other purposes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the civilized world no longer doubts that Germany initiated the great World War, that she had no valid ground for such war, and that her ultimate purpose was to crush France, to absorb the most of Belgium, and to become lord paramount on land and sea throughout the world. For more than 20 years she had been preparing for such a war. She carried on the war on both land and sea in a cruel and most barbarous manner. Her submarine warfare excelled in cruelty piracy in its palmy days; and on land she did not limit her destructiveness to the usual and necessary incidents of war but aimed to make northern France a permanent, uninhabitable desert waste.

The war lasted over four years, and twice during that period, in 1914 and 1918, the issue trembled in the balance; but finally, through the powerful intervention of our country and of our forces, the Great War was brought to a successful end.

While all the Allies had suffered much during the war, France was by far the greatest sufferer, both in life and in property. Our victory in the field will be incomplete unless followed by ample reparation, especially to stricken and devastated France, and by complete disarmament.

More than two years ago Germany entered into a final treaty of peace with all her enemies except our own country, and by this treaty she agreed to make complete reparation and to disarm herself. But she has failed to comply with these vital covenants and has evaded and procrastinated, and continues to evade and procrastinate, indicating some hope that relief may come to her from the failure of the United States to take any action on the treaty. The technical legal relation of our

country to Germany is that existing under the armistice of November, 1918. Such armistices are usually followed and supplemented by a final treaty of peace terminating the war and prescribing all the conditions of a lasting, permanent peace, for while the issue of war is still pending the victor is in a position to impose all the necessary conditions for a permanent peace. After a peace has been established and declared, aside from the conditions imposed in the declaration of peace, the victor and vanquished will negotiate on a footing of equality, for the pressure arising from a war condition no longer exists to impel the vanquished to yield.

The course pursued in establishing final peace by the Knox resolution, as is now proposed, is unusual, halting, equivocating, and only a partial and piecemeal work, omitting some of the most important essentials for a just, permanent, and lasting peace. The resolution establishes peace on the following conditions and reservations: First. All property of the German Government or of German nationals seized, held, and controlled by our Government since April 6, 1917, shall be retained until disposed of by Congress and until the German Government has by treaty made provision for the satisfaction of all claims of our own people for losses suffered by them through the war since its inception in 1914. Second. Granting to our people the most favored nation treatment as to their lives, their property, and their business. Third. Confirming to the United States all fines, penalties, forfeitures, and seizures imposed or made by our Government during the war, and a waiver of all claims of the German Government and its nationals against the United States. And, fourth, a reservation of all benefits conferred upon the United States by the treaty of Versailles, but totally oblivious as to whether the Allies secure any benefits whatsoever under the treaty.

The first three clauses which I have mentioned may well be grouped under the general head of reparation to the United States, so that the only peace condition imposed upon Germany by this resolution is such reparation as is prescribed in the clauses named and the benefits conferred upon the United States by the treaty of Versailles.

When Germany has complied with these conditions she has acquitted herself of all obligations under this resolution, and no further claims can be made upon her for obtaining the peace; and as to the United States, she can breathe freely and be at her ease, for she is no longer under war pressure but merely subject to moral suasion in further negotiations.

Two of the most important and vital matters pertaining to a just and permanent world peace, to wit, disarmament and reparation, are entirely omitted in this resolution. It places our country in an attitude of total indifference in regard to these vital subjects. Germany has heretofore been most reluctant to comply with the reparation and disarmament provisions of the Versailles treaty. Will not the passage of this resolution tend to increase and fortify such reluctance?

By this resolution we insist upon full reparation for ourselves, but are wholly oblivious as to whether our allies, by whose side and aid we vanquished the common enemy, secure any reparation at all. We are also by this resolution wholly oblivious as to the disarmament of Germany—a matter most vital to the future peace of the world. One of the lessons impressed upon the civilized world is that Germany, armed and equipped as she was in July, 1914, would be a constant and continuing menace to her neighbors and to a world peace. It seems to me that our country is vitally interested in removing this menace. Under this peace resolution we have no ground for insisting on the removal of this menace.

To my mind, it is of vital interest to our country and to the entire civilized world that the integrity of the French Republic, its people and country, should be preserved and left untrammelled to work out its own salvation without the menace of war constantly hanging over its head. It would be a blow to the civilized world to suffer France to be obliterated or crushed. While it is of great concern to the entire world, our own country included, that the peace of the world be maintained by the disarmament of Germany, it is of far greater concern to France, the most exposed to the German menace. Poor France, her fairest and best provinces laid waste and reduced to well-nigh a desert by the barbarism of the German war, her people bled white, and suffering as no people within a war zone have suffered since the days of the Thirty Years' War, for her, though almost alone she checked the German advance at the Marne in September, 1914, we seem to indicate by this resolution that we have no concern. As long as we get reparation for ourselves, as long as we get our pound of flesh, we have no concern for devastated and bleeding France, our ally and helpmeet in the Great War. Such is the tenor and spirit of the Knox resolution. I am not a diplomat, and have no gifts of diplomacy, and it is

perhaps on that account that I am unable to concur in this resolution, the passage of which will encourage Germany to continue with her reluctance to comply with the treaty of Versailles as to disarmament and reparation.

The amended resolution contains similar provisions and is on the same lines as to the Austro-Hungarian Empire as in regard to Germany, but the conditions are entirely different. By the treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, and Trianon the Austro-Hungarian Empire as it existed prior to the Great War has been largely disintegrated. Part of the empire has been assigned to the new State of Poland, part to the Kingdom of Rumania, a part has been assigned to Italy, a part constitutes the so-called State of Czechoslovakia, and a part constitutes the Jugo-Slav State. Hungary is left by itself as a separate state, and of the empire there remains only what was known as German Austria and the Tyrol, and not even all of these parts. It is evident that after such disintegration the question of reparation and disarmament does not cut the figure that it does in the case of Germany. Disintegration has effected disarmament, and the release from the yoke of the Austro-Hungarian Empire of so many states and parts of states has to a large extent solved the matter of reparation. Reparation has to a large extent been effected by their securing independence from the yoke of the old empire. If this part of the joint resolution relating to the Austro-Hungarian Empire was by itself, I could vote for it, but not while it is tied to the parts relating to the German Empire.

I ask that a copy of the joint resolution as proposed to be amended by the Committee on Foreign Relations be attached to my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution as reported from the committee was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and for other purposes.

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution of Congress passed April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States of America, and making provisions to prosecute the same, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

That all property of the Imperial German Government, or its successor or successors, and of all German nationals which was, on April 6, 1917, in or has since that date come into the possession or under control of the Government of the United States of America or of any of its officers, agents, or employees, from any source or by any agency whatsoever, shall be retained by the United States of America and no disposition thereof made, except as shall have been heretofore or specifically hereafter shall be provided by Congress, until such time as the German Government has, by treaty with the United States of America, ratification whereof is to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, made suitable provisions for the satisfaction of all claims against the German Government of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America and who have suffered, through the acts of German Government or its agents since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of shares of stock in German, American, or other corporations, or in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war, or otherwise, and also provisions granting to persons owing permanent allegiance to the United States of America most-favored-nation treatment, whether the same be national or otherwise, in all matters affecting residence, business, profession, trade, navigation, commerce, and industrial property rights, and confirming to the United States of America all fines, forfeitures, penalties, and seizures imposed or made by the United States of America during the war, whether in respect to the property of the German Government or German nationals, and waiving any and all pecuniary claims based on events which occurred at any time before the coming into force of such treaty, any existing treaty between the United States of America and Germany to the contrary notwithstanding.

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has not ratified the treaty of Versailles, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled, together with the right to enforce the same, under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof or otherwise, or which under the treaty of Versailles have been stipulated for its benefit, or for the benefit of its nationals, with the same force and effect as if said treaty of Versailles had been ratified by the United States of America, and to which the United States of America is or may become entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

That the joint resolution of Congress approved December 7, 1917, declaring that "a state of war exists between the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government and the Government and the people of the United States of America and making provisions to prosecute the same," be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

That all property of the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, or its successor or successors, and of all nationals of the Austrian Empire or the Kingdom of Hungary which was, on April 6, 1917, in or has since that date come into the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States of America or of any of its officers, agents, or employees from any source or by any agency whatsoever, shall be retained by the United States of America and no disposition thereof made, except as shall have been heretofore or specifically hereafter shall be provided by Congress, until such time as the Austrian Government has, by treaty with the United States of America, ratification whereof is to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, made suitable provisions for the satisfaction

of all claims against the Austrian Government of all persons, wheresoever domiciled, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States of America, and who have suffered through the acts of the Austrian Government or its agents since July 31, 1914, loss, damage, or injury to their persons or property, directly or indirectly, whether through the ownership of shares of stock in Austrian, American, or other corporations, or in consequence of hostilities or of any operations of war or otherwise, and also provisions granting to persons owing permanent allegiance to the United States of America most-favored-nation treatment, whether the same be national or otherwise, in all matters affecting residence, business, profession, trade, navigation, commerce, and industrial property rights, and confirming to the United States of America all fines, forfeitures, penalties, and seizures imposed or made by the United States of America during the war, whether in respect to the property of the Austrian Government or nationals of the Austrian Empire, and waiving any and all pecuniary claims based on events which occurred at any time before the coming into force of such treaty, any existing treaty between the United States of America and Austria to the contrary notwithstanding.

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has not ratified the treaty of St. Germain or the treaty of Trianon, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled, together with the right to enforce the same under the terms of the armistice signed November 3, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof, or otherwise, or which under the treaty of St. Germain or the treaty of Trianon have been stipulated for its benefits or for the benefit of its nationals with the same force and effect as if said treaty of St. Germain and the treaty of Trianon had been ratified by the United States of America, and to which the United States of America is or may become entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution repealing the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany, and the joint resolution of December 7, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Government, and for other purposes."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I feel that I should not let the pending joint resolution come to a vote without expressing in the *RECORD*, in brief, the reasons why I am opposed to it. It is a measure of too grave importance for the future, if not for the present, to allow it to go through without having the *RECORD* contain the statements of those who are opposed to it and having the joint resolution receive reasonable consideration.

Of course, if the joint resolution becomes a law it is the final scene of a great tragedy. So far as we are concerned, it is the ending of the Great War. There may be other treaties in reference to commerce, there may be other arrangements in reference to minor matters, but if the joint resolution becomes the law, as far as we are concerned the World War is ended and we have washed our hands of the transaction.

Mr. President, in passing this resolution I think we should bear in mind that we did not declare war on the German Government. We never have declared war on the German Government. If there ever was a nation in the history of the world that went into war with clean hands it was the Government of the United States and the people of the United States when they became involved in the war with Germany. We were patient to the last degree. We allowed our patience to continue until it brought down upon our heads the criticism of the other great nations of the world and the rebuke of some of our own people.

But I am glad that we were patient. I am glad that we did not sooner take the final act, sending our soldiers to the battle fields and sacrificing millions of property and piling a debt that amounts to billions upon the backs of children yet unborn. It is at least a satisfaction that we went to war because there was no other course left for us.

But when we did engage in the Great War it was not an act of hostility on our part. The German Imperial Government had closed the seas of the world to our ships and had notified us that we must follow a lane through the Atlantic Ocean for our ships of commerce, and that only such ships as she was willing to consent to follow the lines of commerce could go safely across the sea. She had notified us that we must take the place of a second-rate nation in the world and bow to her imperial military power. Then, when we declined to do so, she sank one of our ships, the *City of Memphis*, returning without cargo to its home port, on the high seas away beyond the line of conflict or the battle line raging in Europe. She fired upon our flag, imperiled the lives of our citizens, and destroyed our property. It was then that the Congress of the United States passed a resolution on the 6th day of April, 1917, declaring that a state of war existed.

Of course, I recognize the fact that my party made a proposal for peace. We were unable to accomplish the ratification of the treaty of peace along the lines that we proposed. A political revolution has taken place in the United States. The Republican Party has come into power commanding a majority of 22 votes in the Senate and a majority of 165 votes in the House of Representatives, and it is in absolute control of the executive branch of the Government. I recognize the fact that

the responsibility for making peace now rests upon the great party in power, but I can not understand why the party in power, in attempting to accomplish what we all believe in, the making of a treaty of peace and the wiping out of war conditions, seeks to accomplish it in this way.

The important part of the joint resolution, or the most important part of it from the standpoint of making peace, is contained in the first six lines of the amended resolution, which reads:

That the joint resolution of Congress passed April 6, 1917, declaring a state of war to exist between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States of America, and making provisions to prosecute the same, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

I can not understand why the majority party desires to repeal the resolution passed by Congress under date of April 6, 1917, declaring that a state of war existed between our Government and the Imperial Government of Germany. We do not wipe out existing facts by repealing legislation. We can destroy some laws and the effect of some laws by repealing the enactment of the laws. If we pass a bill providing for the punishment of crime we can repeal the law and possibly can allow the criminal to go free who has not already been convicted under the law. But there are some laws which can not have that retroactive effect. If we pass a law authorizing the building of a bridge across a great river and the bridge is built, we can not tear down the bridge by repealing the law that authorized its construction; we can not affect the status of the bridge by repealing the law that authorized it.

The same is true with reference to the pending resolution. We did not declare war against Germany. It puts us in a false position to assume that we did. We recognized the fact that the German Imperial Government had declared war on us, not by paper enactment, not by official declaration, but by force of arms. By the destruction of our property, the murder of our citizens, the dishonor of our flag, the German Government declared war against us. We recognized the fact that war existed by a resolution of Congress, by the resolution which is sought to be repealed.

Why do you want to repeal it? Do you want the pages of history to reflect the idea that we made a mistake on the 6th day of April, 1917, when we declared that a state of war existed between the Imperial German Government and the people of the United States, and that as we made the mistake you want to retract it? Is that the purpose of the resolution?

It is not necessary to retract what we did on the 6th day of April, 1917, in order to accomplish peace or to make the peace of the world. Or if you do not wish to retract it and do not think we made a mistake in declaring that a state of war existed by reason of the acts of the German Government, then do you intend to withdraw your declaration of the fact of the existence of a state of war in order that it may affect conditions that have arisen since that declaration, conditions which affect property and the rights of our citizens and the safety of the Nation? If that is not your purpose, why do you proceed to declare peace in this unusual way?

Of course, the last sentence that I read proceeds to say:

And said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

I think if you said that you merely wanted to make a marker as to your determination when war ceased and you concluded to do it in this unusual way, you might accomplish that result by saying the war between the Government of the United States and the Imperial German Government is at an end. But you are not satisfied with that. You desire to abandon the declaration that you made on the 6th day of April, 1917.

I know not the reason now for your action in the matter; time may disclose it; but I think it is an unusual and an unnecessary way to proceed. So far as I am concerned, I am not willing to retract one statement or one act or one position that the Government of the United States took on the 6th day of April, 1917, in declaring that a state of war existed.

Mr. President, of course we are only talking about a technical state of war. The actual condition of war terminated more than two years ago. We were one of the signatory powers to an armistice agreed upon between the German Government and ourselves and our allies. But in addition to that the Chief Executive of this Government then withdrew from the battle line in Europe more than 2,000,000 men. We brought them home. We mustered them out of the Army. We returned them to their homes. We relieved ourselves of all opportunity to continue the war with Germany, and when we did that war ceased so far as actual war conditions are concerned. All that has been left for us to do since that time was to determine on what conditions we would allow the German Government to make peace with us and what terms we would impose upon her as a condition of peace.

Now, so far as my own position is concerned, the record of the last two Congresses reflects it. I believe when the President of the United States entered into an agreement with those with whom we conducted the war, our allies, as to the terms of peace, that we should have upheld his hand. So far as I am concerned personally, I believe that we made a great mistake not only for ourselves but for the world when we did not agree to the unconditional ratification of the treaty of Versailles. That, however, is only my opinion. I am only one Senator. I recognize that that issue was considered and failed of determination. No affirmative action was taken by the Senate, and finally the party that is now in control of the Government rejected the treaty of Versailles by returning it to the President. As to whether they are right or whether we are right, is not a question that we need now discuss. It is a question that has been fully discussed in the past, and as to which finally, when we have passed away, history will record the verdict.

We know that the party in power in the Senate and in the executive branch of the Government will not take the viewpoint of the last administration in the settlement of the war conditions. Of course, there are still two ways to make technical peace with Germany. One is for the President of the United States to return the treaty of Versailles to the Senate and for the Senate to ratify it, either unconditionally or to ratify it with reservations or amendments. It is evident that that will not be done. There is no power in the Senate to act along that line unless the President initiates the act. The present Executive has been in office for nearly two months, and the treaty of Versailles lies on his desk. If he desired the Senate further to consider the ratification of that treaty, I have no doubt he would have laid it before the Senate with his views. Not having done so, I assume that he is opposed to making peace in that way.

More than that, when the leaders of his party propose a declaration of peace by congressional enactment and not through treaty, I assume that it is a fact beyond dispute, and that the President of the United States does not intend to continue any further the negotiations looking to the ratification of the treaty of Versailles and the making of peace in conjunction with our allies.

There is, however, yet another way for the President to make peace. If he desires to abandon those together with whom we conducted the war, he can enter into negotiations with the German Government looking to making a treaty of peace with them and reaching a final determination of the war in that way.

The party in power have the right to initiate such proposals; they have a right, if they choose to take the responsibility, to abandon the treaty of Versailles; but I think if they do the responsibility still rests on them to make a peace that will be honorable to the people of the United States and will protect the legitimate rights of the people of this country in reaching a peace determination. I contend that the pending resolution does not accomplish either result. We fought the war together with France and England and Italy and some of the smaller nations, who, at our invitation, entered into a treaty of peace with Germany, abandoning some of the rights of the victors over the vanquished, believing under that contract that their future peace and happiness would be protected; that under that agreement lasting peace could be preserved by the world, instead of by holding natural boundaries and erecting artificial defenses. We have proceeded, however, to reject the terms of our own agreement and to abandon our allies before the final conclusions of peace have been reached with them.

We have been most generous to the fallen foe in exacting no reparations from him except that we may hold certain property that fell into our hands during the war to guarantee the legitimate claims of our own citizens; but can we say that it is just to our allies that the fallen foe shall not pay to them, as reparation, some of the damage which has been inflicted in the Great War?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. Unfortunately I was called out of the Chamber while the Senator from Alabama was discussing a certain feature of the resolution, and near the latter end of his remarks on that subject I return. Does the Senator from Alabama consider that the passage of the resolution now under consideration would be the final word, so far as the present administration has given Congress its views, as to how we should proceed? Does the Senator feel that that would necessarily be the final word in negotiating peace? To continue the question, does not

the Senator think that it would be very natural and proper to consider the Versailles treaty with probable changes, certain of its features being expunged, in order that we might take up the very features that I think the Senator was discussing or proceeding to discuss as I left the Chamber, relating to American rights, the protection of America's interest, reparations, and so forth? Why would the adoption of the so-called Knox resolution prevent Congress from taking up the Versailles treaty and making such changes as we might deem wise and necessary?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am rather surprised that my good friend from New Jersey, whose ability I admire, should ask me that question, because I think the resolution presented by his own side of the Chamber answers the question for him. The last line of the first paragraph of that resolution reads:

Said state of war is hereby declared at an end.

I am talking about matters that grew out of war—protection to our citizens on emerging from a war status; aid to our allies or ourselves by way of reparations consequent upon a war status. The resolution of the Senator's party declares that the war is ended; that is a final declaration; there can be no other. If it is desired to go, hat in hand, to the German Government and say, "Now the war is ended, but you have misbehaved so far as our allies are concerned, and we would humbly crave that you proceed to pay them the reparation that you agreed to pay when the armistice was signed on the 11th day of November, 1918." Of course, that could be done, but in that event we would only go as a suppliant and not by right of conquest in war, because the joint resolution expressly declares that the war is at an end.

So, if we mean it; if we are honest in our declaration, the war is ended, and there will be no further war status, and we must treat Germany in making any further contract with her as we would treat Belgium or Spain or some South American country.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield further to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. The great ability of the Senator from Alabama as a lawyer, versed in international law, we do not question. I am proceeding to ask him a question from what I would consider purely a business standpoint. Does the Senator from Alabama think for one moment that the declaration on the part of the Senate that a state of war is at an end would in any way make it—I will not say impossible, but improper or unusual, though it may be an unusual method—for the Senate to reconsider the Versailles treaty, which has not been disposed of, but which is still in the hands of the President of the United States, as I understand, and which could be sent here deleted as the administration thought would meet the views of the American people as expressed at the last election? Would there be anything unusual or remarkable or evasive for the Senate of the United States, even with a declaration that the state of war is at an end, considering America's interest, our allies' interest, and the interest of the world so far as becoming a signatory to the only existing treaty is concerned? Would that in any way, shape, form, or manner necessitate the Government of the United States appealing to or even considering Germany?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that there are some things that he can do but once. The Senator can be born only once and he can die only once. A government in a particular instance can declare war only once and it can declare peace only once, so far as a particular transaction is concerned. This declaration that you are proceeding to put through the Congress in this unusual way either means something or it means nothing. Of course if you do not mean it, if you think it is not a valid joint resolution, that it is merely a puff of wind to satisfy somebody, that is different; but if it means what you say—that the war is at an end—then there are no further peace negotiations in reference to the Great War that we can enter into.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, does it not mean simply an expression of an existing fact, that there is no longer any war, and we are simply stating that in an official and legal manner? Why that should in any way prevent the second stage of considering those business details is beyond my ability to understand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If that is all you mean by it, why do you propose to repeal the joint resolution of April 6, 1917, declaring that a state of war existed? If you are simply saying to the world that we recognize that we have withdrawn our armies from the battle lines; that we are no longer holding our cannons' mouths in the faces of the Germans; that we are not any longer mobilizing our men, if that is all you mean by it, why do you want in this declaration to repeal the declaration

we made on the 6th day of April, 1917, that Germany had declared war against us?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, so far as that technical point that the Senator has so well made is concerned, I frankly admit that I see no particular reason for stating the matter in that way; but that is entirely a legal question and one into which I shall not attempt to enter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is a legal question that will haunt us in the future.

Mr. EDGE. I repeat, however, that I see no possible objection to carrying out our responsibility in stages, as it were. We can attach the so-called Knox resolution to a consideration of the Versailles treaty, so far as my judgment is concerned; but to do it in this way seems to me entirely orderly and entirely proper. We state a fact—that peace now exists. We then consider the next stage—America's and her allies' interests. Then, if we want to go still further on the question the Senator referred to in the early part of his remarks—that of disarmament—there is nothing in the world to prevent us from considering that as a third stage of the procedure.

It seems to me the matter is presented to us in a very orderly and regular manner.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I can only say that, while I have very great respect for the Senator from New Jersey, I think his way of approaching the peace question is a very unusual one; and I am very much afraid that if he pursues it he is going to be disappointed in what he evidently desires to accomplish, and perhaps some others will carry out what they really desire to accomplish.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to inquire, after this joint resolution is passed, whether it would be possible under any kind of legal construction to call any treaty which might thereafter be entered into between this Government and Germany a peace treaty?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It seems to me it is clear that we could not call it a peace treaty. We might renew our peace understanding but we would have passed the stage where we could make a treaty of peace, because we make treaties of peace only when a status of war exists. If anybody ever heard of a nation making a treaty of peace when at least a technical status of war did not exist—before it was suggested in this joint resolution—I have never heard of it. It is new to me.

I am afraid that this joint resolution is going to command the votes of Senators in this Chamber who occupy the attitude toward it that has been expressed by the Senator from New Jersey, who really believe that we should not abandon our allies before the work is finished; that we should not take our hands from the plow before the sun is set; yet for some reason they are willing to go ahead, drive this joint resolution to a conclusion—a conclusion that can not be recalled after it has been enacted—and then let the Nation take the responsibility of their acts.

Mr. President, it is not merely the fact that the German Empire is refusing now to recognize the armistice of the 11th day of November, 1918, and is refusing to recognize its obligations under the treaty of Versailles; it is not merely the fact that we are abandoning those with whom our sons fought; but it is the fact that we are compromising our own people and our own honor in making a peace in this way that makes me feel that this joint resolution should be rejected.

I am not criticizing your party if you refuse to enter into the treaty of Versailles. I think we should enter into it; but you have been returned to power, and it is for your President, our President, the President selected by those who voted your party ticket, to initiate the terms on which we shall make peace with Germany. He can make a separate treaty of peace with Germany, and he can make it more effectively, in my judgment, if an actual technical state of war exists than he can do after you have declared that the war is at an end, and we are only negotiating a contract between two peaceful nations to renew our commerce, to recognize the rights of our citizens in the other countries, and even, if certain property rights are reserved under this joint resolution, to recognize those property rights. I think that if you intend to make a treaty of peace with Germany, you should have it understood with her as a prerequisite to our signing the treaty that Germany in good faith shall carry out the contract she made at Versailles with our allies. If we do not do that, we abandon the position that our sons took on the battle fields of France.

Mr. President, I am not going to occupy the time of the Senate in going into any details as to why I think this joint resolution is ill-advised.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. Underwood. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. I have been out of the Chamber for a little while. Has the Senator discussed the question as to what effect it would have just now if we were to pass this joint resolution, and our Army, such as we have in Germany, should be withdrawn just at this critical stage of the affairs between Great Britain and France on the one side and Germany on the other?

Mr. Underwood. No; I have not.

Mr. McKellar. I should like to hear the Senator's views on that subject.

Mr. Underwood. I do not regard that as the main issue, but I regard that as a very pertinent issue involved in this case. It is one that addresses itself to the immediate present. Of course the minute this joint resolution is passed, if it means what it says, it means that a state of war no longer exists between this country and Germany, there is no reason in the world for keeping an American soldier in Germany one hour longer.

Mr. Williams. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. Underwood. I do.

Mr. Williams. Furthermore, is there any right, even, to do it?

Mr. Underwood. No.

Mr. Williams. The only right that France and England have to keep soldiers there now is under the terms of the treaty, and the only right that we have is under the terms of the armistice, recognizing a state of war as still continuing; so that if the state of war ceases, and we are not a party to any treaty with Germany, we have no right at all to maintain a single soldier in Germany.

Mr. Underwood. The Senator is absolutely right in the position he takes, that not only should the soldiers be brought home, but we have no right whatever to maintain them there for an hour.

Mr. King. It would be an act of war if we kept them there.

Mr. Underwood. It would be an act of war to continue them in Germany longer than the length of time that through peaceful methods it takes to remove them from that country in good faith.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, if the Germans do not fulfill their treaty obligations with the Allies, and we should pass this joint resolution and withdraw our troops just at this time, and the Allies should invade Germany to force a compliance with the terms of the treaty, would it not be inevitable that we would thereby ally ourselves with Germany and against our former allies, in substance and effect?

Mr. Underwood. I can not say that I would go as far as the Senator states the matter, that we would ally ourselves with Germany; but I agree with him thoroughly in the proposition he states, that this is a most inopportune time for a great Nation like ours to lay down a battle line. The critical hour has struck in Europe as to whether peace is going to continue in Europe or whether Europe is going back to war again. If it is recognized that the strength of our powerful influence in world affairs still stands with the men with whom we fought as our allies in the Great War, if that influence still stands to enable them to see that the German Government pays the price of the war it brought upon the world, this critical hour may pass without further bloodshed. But let our restraining hand be removed in this fateful hour, do we know the German Government may not make alliances with other nations, and other people may not give her a man power greater than that possessed by both France and England? Do we know that Germany will not have the opportunity to get her foodstuffs and her raw materials in greater abundance than our allies can get them, if we abandon the field? In this critical hour, after we have accomplished all for the world, after we have sacrificed a hundred thousand men on the battle fields of France and paid untold millions to reclaim the world against the monster of war, after we have heard it repeated in this Chamber on every side, time and time again, that the great World War would be fought in vain if the result of it was not the ultimate peace of the world, the maintenance of the world's peace for all the future, shall we abandon the fight and withdraw from the field?

Mr. Watson of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. Underwood. I yield.

Mr. Watson of Georgia. Will the Senator from Alabama explain in what practical way it would benefit our people as

a whole if we let the condition remain as it is and has been since the armistice was declared in 1918, allowing it to remain indefinite and uncertain, as it now is?

Mr. Underwood. I do not favor that. I do not favor its being left uncertain. More than a year ago I was very anxious to have a status of peace declared. Of course, I was for the ratification of the treaty of Versailles, as many of my colleagues were, but that failed. I am not favoring the continuation of the present status at all. I have just said that I think there is another way. We may not have the right to expect of the party in power that they shall ratify the treaty of Versailles; but we have a right to expect of them that they shall make peace along lines that not only will protect us and our rights but that shall not be an abandonment of the men we fought with, a distinct abandonment of them.

Mr. Watson of Georgia. As the Senator from Alabama knows, after a private conference with me, I have a very grave doubt myself about whether we on this side should vote for the pending joint resolution as it now stands. But the Senator is aware of the fact, as the whole world is, that France has not considered us in the arrangements she has gone forward and made in Syria and in other parts of the world; in South Africa, that Great Britain has not considered us at all; that Italy has not considered us at all. Should not the question be how the joint resolution affects us? Is it not time we were attending to our own business and our own people and getting some practical way of benefiting our own people by putting an end to the uncertainty which exists in international law as to our relations with Germany?

Mr. Underwood. Of course, I think the Senator's question is very pertinent to the issue, and I am free to say that our first and greatest responsibility, in my judgment, always rests in taking care of our own people when it can be done with honor. But we will never take care of our people unless we keep within those standards that nations should live up to, as a man never takes care of himself properly unless he remains within the standards that a man should live up to.

Mr. Williams. Like charity, honor begins at home; but it does not end there.

Mr. Underwood. Surely. What I mean by that is this: I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Georgia that we ought to urge an early conclusion of technical war, but I think we should know definitely what we are doing and what is accomplished. We declare in this paper which I hold in my hand that a state of war is ended. There is no declaration on the part of Germany. I am sure the Senator from Georgia agrees with me that any agreement between two nations is like a private contract, on which the minds of the two nations must meet at the same time in order to make it binding, to make it effective, to mean anything for the benefit of the people of either country. We have no indication whatever that the German Government will accept anything that is said in this resolution. We have no indication whatever that she will regard it or be bound by it. In other words, if we pass the resolution, we do not accomplish, in my judgment, what the Senator from Georgia desires, that a fixed status of peace shall be arrived at.

But there is a way to accomplish that, and that is by the President of the United States entering into conversations with the representatives of the German Government, if he does not desire to make peace along with the Allies, and let those conversations reach a point where our representatives or ambassadors can meet their representatives or ambassadors and agree on the terms of a peace treaty, and that treaty can be put in black and white, and then we can sign it and ratify it and know what is being done. That is the way the founders of this Government contemplated we should make all treaties and all peace.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if it is not true that this is the first time in all our history when a peace has ever been sought to be made by a resolution of the Congress; and when the two Houses and the executive department of the Government are in complete control of one party, is there any reason why we can not follow the usual and constitutional methods of making peace with Germany, namely, by treaty initiated by the President and ratified by the Senate? Why is it at this time, in the peculiar situation which exists between us and the other countries, both our allies and our former enemies, that we should abandon the usual and constitutional methods of effecting peace and do it by a resolution of Congress, which is revolutionary in so far as our practices of government are concerned?

Mr. Underwood. I can not answer the Senator's question as to whether a treaty of peace has ever been made in this way before or not. I know of none myself.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I know it never has been done in the history of our Republic, although we have engaged in a number of wars.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator is correct in his statement that it never has been done; but it is a mighty good precedent to establish.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Alabama think that he has gone a little too far if he meant to say that we ought to put an end to the state of technical war between us and Germany, even by a treaty between us and Germany, unless he further adds that there ought to be an understanding with our late war associates as to the terms of that treaty?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure the Senator overlooked the statement I made a moment ago that I thought it ought to be done within our honor as a Nation, which, of course, will not mean the abandonment of our allies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was afraid the Senator's after remark might lead some one to believe that he thought that within our honor we could still effect a treaty of peace with Germany without any consultation at all with our late associates. I do not believe that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not, either. But I want to answer the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON] as to the fact that our allies have gone ahead in settling the territorial questions of the world without consulting us. When the treaty of Versailles was made, so far as the Executive could make us a part of it, we were a party to it. It was contemplated then by those who signed it that we would be a party to it, and the disposition of German territory, German islands, and property the title to which was left in a doubtful condition by reason of the war, was left to the determination of a war commission and action under the treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations.

When the treaty came to the United States Senate, where it failed of ratification, of course, pending the question of ratification, there was a halt on the part of the Executive of our Government, waiting to see what the Senate would do. During that halt naturally we had no representatives in these councils. The world had to march on. The world could not stop in its progress. The great questions involved in the World War had to be settled by the people involved in it, although, as we were one of the victors in the great struggle, as we paid the price of the war as well as our allies, I thought we were entitled to a voice, and a full voice, in the settlement of the world's affairs, such a voice as we desired to exercise, and I think so now. We may not want to go to the full extent to which those who are next-door neighbors to the issues want to go, but if we want to have a voice in it we should have it. But I am not prepared to criticize those who marched on when we had stopped by the wayside and were not following the column.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Assuming that the pending joint resolution is defeated, we must bear in mind that the preceding administration and the present administration have placed themselves in the position of claiming a part of the spoils of the war. They contend that the victory was partly won by ourselves, and that we should have a voice in the distribution of conquered territory. If we should make any sort of a separate treaty, of course other than the treaty of Versailles, which the Senate refused to ratify, could not our late allies claim, with as much show of reason as they could if we passed this resolution, that we had deserted them and adopted a course of our own?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we are going to make a separate treaty at all, I think the position the Senator takes is the only one which can be maintained, because, mark you, this resolution is making peace. I am sure the Senator from Georgia does not occupy the position taken by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] that by the resolution if it passes we have not reached a peace status, and that we can still deal with the enemy in terms of war. If the resolution passes unconditionally, we have reached a status of peace and unconditionally we have abandoned our allies and anything we might claim as our rights under the treaty of Versailles. But it might be possible, if we made a separate treaty of peace with Germany where the terms are set out, within those terms we might reserve our rights in such a way that we could do so without abandoning our allies as to war conditions of the past and protect them, and yet have a voice left to us in the world affairs, which we are proposing absolutely and uncondi-

tionally to abandon by the declaration that the state of war has ceased to exist, and to abandon any rights we may have, not only as to Germany but as to participating in the ending of the war, and the questions growing out of the ending of the war by virtue of being one of the nations that accomplished that result. Of course we can, with reference to these islands, if we pass the resolution, go as an independent nation, as Peru or Mexico might go, and present any claims as to the island of Yap or some other territory, or we might voice as a great nation our viewpoint as to what England and France and the other controlling nations of Europe are doing; but we would only do it as an outsider, and we would no longer be in the position of one of the nations that had a right to demand that its position be recognized. We would have abandoned our rights because in the passage of the pending joint resolution we abandon our allies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is, the Senator from Alabama means all of our rights as a war associate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And not our independent national rights.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I mean our rights as a war associate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The joint resolution provides:

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has not ratified the treaty of Versailles, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled, together with the right to enforce the same, under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof or otherwise, or which under the treaty of Versailles have been stipulated for its benefit or for the benefit of its nationals, with the same force and effect as if said treaty of Versailles had been ratified by the United States of America and to which the United States of America is or may become entitled as one of the principal allied and associated powers.

The question I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama is whether, in the view of the Senator, not having signed the treaty and not being a party to the contract, it is possible for the United States to reserve rights in a contract to which it has refused to become a party? I should like to have the opinion of the Senator on that subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it can unless the contract, so far as the German rights are concerned, is recognized by Germany. The resolution does not propose that this action shall await the acceptance of it by the German Government. It declares it now and without any acceptance by the German Government. It proposes to reserve rights that we have against the German Government. I think that is absurd.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am a little afraid that the Senator from Tennessee may be misunderstood. Of course, the resolution does not mean that we reserve any rights under the treaty. It says merely that we reserve certain rights under the armistice.

Mr. McKELLAR. And under the treaty, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it does not. If the Senator will read it more carefully, he will see that it says rights under the terms of the armistice. Now, this is the point which occurs to me: The armistice has been terminated by the consent of all the parties to it. There can not be a continuing right under an instrument which itself no longer continues. So if we have any rights at all to be reserved as a party to an international understanding they ought to have been rights under the treaty. We could not reserve them, because we are not parties to the treaty. We are in the same position as a neutral, with those rights which any sovereign nation on earth has with regard to its own interests, but not having come into our rights as a result of the new status of affairs.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator entirely in what he has said as to the meaning of it, except that I still think, after having read the provision again, that the Senator is mistaken in saying that it does not attempt to reserve such rights as we may have under the treaty of Versailles, or rather such rights under the treaty of Versailles as have been stipulated for our benefit. That is the wording of the joint resolution. I take the position that it is impossible by a resolution to reserve rights which may have been stipulated for the benefit of the United States in a treaty which the United States has declined to sign.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think if the Senator will read it more carefully he will see that it provides—

That until by treaty or act or joint resolution of Congress it shall be determined otherwise, the United States of America, although it has—

It means to say "they have"—

not ratified the treaty of Versailles, reserves for itself and its nationals all of the rights, powers, claims, privileges, indemnities, reparations, or advantages to which it and its nationals are or may become entitled,

together with the right to enforce the same under the terms of the armistice signed November 11, 1918, or any extensions or modifications thereof—

Mr. McKELLAR. Read on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am going to read on.

Or otherwise—

Mr. McKELLAR. Read on just a little further.

Mr. WILLIAMS (reading):

Or which under the treaty of Versailles have been stipulated for its benefit or for the benefit of its nationals, with the same force and effect as if said treaty of Versailles had been ratified by the United States of America.

The Senator from Tennessee is right. I had not myself read the provision carefully. It is much more absurd than I thought it possibly could be. The idea of claiming rights under a provision of a treaty which we have affirmatively refused to enter into is one of the most absurd things you could possibly imagine. I thought it referred merely to the armistice and subsequent modifications and changes in the terms of the armistice, and not, of course, under the treaty, to which we are not parties. That language might have been used when the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] originally introduced the resolution, while the question of the treaty was still pending, but evidently he must have overlooked the changed conditions that occurred afterwards. It can not have any sense in it now that we have affirmatively refused to have anything to do with the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is any other Senator who desires to speak this afternoon. I am very anxious to secure a vote on the joint resolution as soon as possible. I have talked with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I hope we shall be able to reach a vote on Saturday. If there is no one who desires to speak further now, I shall move an executive session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that, of course, I did not have an opportunity to consult all the gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, but the other day when we were not prepared to go ahead with the resolution, and I did not wish to delay it by any unusual tactics, I stated to the Senator from Massachusetts that if he would let it go over I would endeavor to secure a final vote on Saturday. I hope that Senators on this side of the Chamber will be agreeable to that proposal and help to carry it out. In the meantime we can let the resolution run over until Saturday, with information to absentees that on Saturday we shall vote, if that course is agreeable.

Mr. LODGE. We can send out notice to that effect. Of course I shall call up the resolution whenever Senators desire to debate it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That will be satisfactory. I think probably several Senators will wish to debate it to-morrow, and we might gain a little more time by taking a recess.

Mr. LODGE. To take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Twelve o'clock I think will be better.

Mr. LODGE. Very well. In the meantime, if no one desires to speak further—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is the intention to take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow with the joint resolution pending?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, it will be kept pending.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will state to the Senator that I am not prepared to speak to-day, but I will speak to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to give all the time Senators may desire. We have a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations to-morrow, with a hearing regarding the Chinese treaty, but that will not interfere in any way if we meet at 12.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand that it will be agreeable to meet at 12.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, April 29, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1921.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

DISTRICT OF COLORADO.

Frank W. Howbert.

DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA.

Albert B. White.

MEMBER OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

John R. Mitchell, of St. Paul, Minn., to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board for a term of 10 years.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas W. Whittle, of New York, N. Y., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Frederick J. H. Kracke, of Brooklyn, N. Y., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Surgeon to be senior surgeon.

George B. Young, March 12, 1920.

Passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons from August 29, 1920.

Paul Preble.

Randolph M. Grimm.

Joseph R. Ridlon.

Charles M. Fauntleroy.

Hermon E. Hasseltine.

James P. Leake.

Lawrence Kolb.

David C. Turnipseed.

Carlisle P. Knight.

Warren F. Draper.

George Parcher.

Louis Schwartz.

Robert H. Heterick.

Charles L. Williams.

Grover A. Kempf.

Louis R. Thompson.

Assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons.

Clifford R. Eskey, August 19, 1920.

William D. Heaton, July 15, 1920.

Robert R. Ivey, July 20, 1920.

John D. Reichard, May 12, 1920.

James F. Worley, September 25, 1918.

Edwin O. Woods, September 6, 1920.

Walter T. Harrison, October 26, 1920.

Charles Armstrong, October 27, 1920.

Rolla E. Dyer, October 31, 1920.

Justin K. Fuller, October 27, 1920.

Robert W. Hart, January 30, 1921.

Doctors to be assistant surgeons.

Lynn A. Fullerton, October 4, 1920.

Marion R. King, October 4, 1920.

Lester C. Scully, October 4, 1920.

Floyd C. Turner, September 30, 1920.

Fortunat A. Troie, from date of oath.

Ralph D. Lille, from date of oath.

Thomas S. Love, from date of oath.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 28, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thy mercy, we look to Thy love, we call upon Thy compassion; therefore we are not consumed.

May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread public interest in providing immediately better hospital facilities and care for the ex-service men who are suffering with insanity and nervous disorders, I, as a medical expert in these diseases, ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF H. R. 3116.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill (H. R. 3116) validating the homestead entry of Mike Campbell for certain public land in Alaska transferred from the Committee on the Territories to the Committee on the Public Lands. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on the Territories, and it is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent for the change of reference indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if it is agreed that it properly belongs to his committee?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. It was before the Committee on the Public Lands last session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 4810, which we had under consideration yesterday, the China trade bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill which was under consideration yesterday. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Are they to be the gentleman's own original remarks?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Cravens, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution creating a commission to represent the United States in the celebration of the first centennial of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Peru; and

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution creating a commission to represent the United States in the celebration of the first centennial of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate depositaries of public moneys in foreign countries and in the Territories and insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COMPANIES TO PROMOTE TRADE IN CHINA.

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned on yesterday the previous question had been ordered on the bill H. R. 4810, which was reported to the House with amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report it forthwith with an amendment striking out section 23, which section I will ask the Clerk to report. It is the section with reference to the taxing feature of the bill. I understand it is now section 24.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARNER moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 4810) to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with an amendment striking out, on page 18, line 3 of the bill, all of section 23 (now section 24), which reads as follows:

"SEC. 23. (a) That section 231 of the revenue act of 1918 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof, inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and adding a new subdivision to read as follows:

"(15) A corporation organized under the China trade act, 1921, but only if and with respect to any taxable year for which (a) it files a return at the time and place provided in section 241, made in the manner provided in section 239, and containing such information as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may by regulation prescribe; (b) it declares dividends during the taxable year in an amount equal to one-third of its net income the payment of which not later than 60 days after the close of such taxable year is assured in such manner as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may require; (c) it derives less than 5 per cent of its gross income from sources within the United States; and (d) the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that during the taxable year the corporation in all respects has complied

with the provisions of the China trade act, 1921, and regulations made thereunder. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall make all regulations necessary for the determination of such exemption and of the liability of shareholders or members to taxation in respect to dividends paid by such corporation."

"(b) Section 1 of the revenue act of 1918 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"A corporation organized under the China trade act, 1921, shall for the purposes of this act be considered a domestic corporation."

"(c) Sections 232, 233, and 234 of the revenue act of 1918 are amended by inserting in each of such sections, after the words 'corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 230,' the words 'or organized under the China trade act, 1921.'

"(d) Section 240 of the revenue act of 1918 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subdivision to read as follows:

"(d) A corporation organized under the China trade act, 1921, shall not be deemed to be affiliated with any other corporation within the meaning of this section."

"(e) Section 254 of the revenue act of 1918 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 254. That every corporation subject to the tax imposed by this title, every personal service corporation, and every corporation organized under the China trade act, 1921, shall, when required by the commissioner, render a correct return, duly verified under oath, of its payments of dividends, stating the name and address of each stockholder, the number of shares owned by him, and the amount of dividends paid to him."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to recommit the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in order to get a record vote, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. It is clear that no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members. As many as are in favor of the motion to recommit will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed with answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 71, nays 265, answered "present" 4, not voting 89, as follows:

YEAS—71.

Aswell	Favrot	Lankford	Rankin
Bankhead	Fulmer	Larsen, Ga.	Rucker
Black	Garner	Lazarus	Sanders, Tex.
Blanton	Garrett, Tex.	Lea, Calif.	Sandlin
Bowling	Gilbert	London	Sears
Box	Goldsborough	Lyon	Sisson
Briggs	Hammer	McClintic	Smithwick
Brinson	Herrick	McDuffie	Steagall
Bulwinkle	Huddleston	Maloney	Stedman
Cantrill	James, Mich.	Mansfield	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	James, Va.	Martin	Stoll
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Va.	Swank
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Miss.	O'Connor	Taylor, Colo.
Deal	Jones, Tex.	Oldfield	Tyson
Dominick	Kincheloe	Oliver	Weaver
Drane	Kindred	Parks, Ark.	Wilson
Driver	King	Quin	Wingo
Dupré	Lanham	Raker	

NAYS—265.

Ackerman	Christopherson	Frothingham	Kissel
Anderson	Clague	Funk	Kline, N. Y.
Andrews	Clarke, N. Y.	Garrett, Tenn.	Kline, Pa.
Anthony	Classon	Gensman	Knight
Appleby	Clouse	Gerner	Kopp
Arentz	Cole	Glynn	Kraus
Atkeson	Connell	Gorman	Kunz
Bacharach	Connolly, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Lawrence
Barbour	Cooper, Ohio	Green, Iowa	Layton
Barkley	Copley	Greene, Mass.	Leatherwood
Beck	Coughlin	Greene, Vt.	Lee, N. Y.
Beedy	Cramton	Griest	Lehlbach
Begg	Crisp	Griffin	Linthicum
Bell	Curry	Hadley	Logan
Benham	Dale	Hardy, Colo.	Longworth
Bird	Dallinger	Hardy, Tex.	Lowrey
Bixler	Darrow	Harrison	Luce
Blakeney	Davis, Tenn.	Hawes	Luhling
Bland, Ind.	Denison	Hawley	McArthur
Bland, Va.	Dickinson	Hayden	McCormick
Boles	Dunbar	Hays	McFadden
Bond	Dunn	Hersey	McLaughlin, Mich.
Bowers	Dyer	Hickey	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Brand	Echols	Hill	McPherson
Brennan	Edmonds	Himes	MacGregor
Brooks, Ill.	Elliott	Hoch	Madden
Brooks, Pa.	Ellis	Hudspeth	Magee
Brown, Tenn.	Elston	Hull	Mapes
Buchanan	Evans	Humphreys	Merritt
Burdick	Fairchild	Husted	Michaelson
Burroughs	Fairfield	Jefferis	Michener
Burness	Faust	Johnson, S. Dak.	Miller
Burton	Fenn	Johnson, Wash.	Mills
Butler	Fess	Kahn	Millspaugh
Byrnes, S. C.	Fish	Kearns	Mondell
Byrns, Tenn.	Fisher	Keller	Montague
Cable	Fitzgerald	Kelley, Mich.	Montoya
Campbell, Kans.	Flood	Kelly, Pa.	Moore, Ill.
Cannon	Fordney	Kennedy	Moore, Ohio
Carter	Foster	Ketcham	Moore, Ind.
Chalmers	Freeman	Kinkaid	Morgan
Chindblom	French	Kirkpatrick	Mott

Mudd	Ramsayer	Speaks	Vinson
Murphy	Ransley	Sproul	Voigt
Nelson, A. P.	Rayburn	Stafford	Volstead
Nelson, J. M.	Reavis	Stephens	Walsh
Newton, Minn.	Reece	Stinness	Walters
Newton, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Kans.	Wason
Nolan	Rhodes	Summers, Wash.	Webster
Norton	Ricketts	Summers, Tex.	Wheeler
Ogden	Riddick	Sweet	White, Kans.
Olpp	Riordan	Swing	White, Me.
Overstreet	Roach	Tague	Williams
Padgett	Robertson	Taylor, Tenn.	Williamson
Paige	Robison	Temple	Winslow
Park, Ga.	Rose	Ten Eyck	Wood, Ind.
Parker, N. J.	Sabath	Thompson	Woodruff
Parker, N. Y.	Sanders, Ind.	Tillman	Woods, Va.
Farrish	Sanders, N. Y.	Tilson	Wright
Patterson, Mo.	Scott, Mich.	Timberlake	Wurzbach
Patterson, N. J.	Scott, Tenn.	Tinkham	Wyant
Perkins	Shaw	Towner	Yates
Peters	Shelton	Underhill	Young
Petersen	Shreve	Upshaw	Zihlman
Pou	Sinclair	Vare	
Purnell	Sinnot	Vestal	
Radcliffe	Smith		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Cockran	Collier	Cooper, Wis.	Mead
		NOT VOTING—89.	
Almon	Gahn	Larson, Minn.	Rouse
Ansorge	Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Ryan
Britten	Good	Lineberger	Schall
Browne, Wis.	Goodykoontz	Little	Siegel
Burke	Gould	Lufkin	Slemp
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Snell
Carew	Haugen	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snyder
Chandler, N. Y.	Hicks	McSwain	Steenerson
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	Mann	Strong, Pa.
Codd	Houghton	Mason	Sullivan
Colton	Hukriede	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Crowther	Hutchinson	O'Brien	Thomas
Cullen	Ireland	Osborne	Treadway
Davis, Minn.	Jacoway	Periman	Vaile
Dempsey	Jones, Pa.	Porter	Volk
Doughton	Kendall	Pringley	Ward, N. C.
Dowell	Kiess	Rainey, Ala.	Ward, N. Y.
Drewry	Kitchin	Reber	Watson
Fields	Kieczka	Reed, W. Va.	Wise
Focht	Knutson	Rosenberg	Woodyard
Frear	Kreider	Rogers	
Free	Lampert	Rosenbloom	
Fuller	Langley	Rossdale	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. COLLIER (for) with Mr. TREADWAY (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GALLIVAN.

Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. JACOWAY.

Mr. REBER with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUKRIEDE with Mr. ALMON.

Mr. MANN with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin with Mr. WISE.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. VOLK with Mr. MCSWAIN.

Mr. IRELAND with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. WARD of North Carolina.

Mr. DOWELL with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.

Mr. SNELL with Mr. DREWRY.

Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY, voted?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded. He is paired.

Mr. COLLIER. I voted "yea." I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on that vote.

The SPEAKER. As many as are in favor of the passage of the bill will rise.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. No; I will withdraw that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee demands the yeas and nays. As many as are in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Not a sufficient number have risen. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 247, noes 39.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. DYER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HON. WILLIAM S. GREENE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, that this is an important anniversary. Our genial and kindly young friend, "Uncle Billy" GREENE, Hon. WILLIAM S. GREENE, of Massachusetts, has this day reached his eightieth milestone. [Applause, the Members rising.] Noting his cheerful smile, I know he finds the landscape at this milestone of his useful and eventful life pleasing and the outlook inspiring. May he live long and remain with us, an honor to the House and to the splendid constituency that has for so long sent him here. [Applause.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill H. R. 4803, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will assume the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4803, the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4803) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is recognized.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman from Texas will withhold for just a moment, I was wondering if we might not be able to agree upon the amount of time.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman wait until I have concluded?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I thought it might be done now without interfering with the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. I would rather proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think it would probably expedite the matter. Otherwise we might get into a considerable tangle.

Mr. BLACK. Well, I will yield to the gentleman if he wishes to do that now.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Some of the Members present are unacquainted with the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the reading of the amendment, not taking it out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. BLACK. That will be agreeable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 43, line 17, after the figures "\$33,000,000," insert:

"Provided, That no part of this sum shall be expended until the President of the United States shall have invited the Governments of all nations to send accredited delegates to an international convention to be held in the United States to consider ways and means of bringing about joint disarmament."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday afternoon just before adjournment I had been recognized by the Chair, and it was my intention to make a few remarks in reply to the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] wherein he denounced in impassioned eloquence the amendment of my colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] upon the ground that to pass it would embarrass the President. As adjournment prevented me from doing it then, I will venture a few words along that line now.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we are making progress when gentlemen on that side of the House exhaust the inspiration of their fiery eloquence in an appeal to refrain from doing

anything or saying anything which will embarrass the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As I listened to the resounding eloquence of the gentleman from Illinois I recalled without difficulty that when Woodrow Wilson, acting as President of the United States and as our accredited representative to the peace conference, was negotiating the Versailles peace treaty, which was his duty and responsibility under the Constitution, I recalled without difficulty that 37 Members of the United States Senate, and all belonging to the political party of the gentleman from Illinois, joined in signing a round robin seeking to tell the President what kind of a treaty he should or should not negotiate, and one of the signers of that round robin was Hon. Warren G. Harding, then a Senator from the State of Ohio and now the President of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for just a question?

Mr. BLACK. In just a moment; then I will yield. Far from having any intention to embarrass the President of the United States by offering an amendment of this kind, I believe that it would be a distinct favor to him for this House to make a clear and definite expression as to the calling of a disarmament conference. I believe that he would sincerely appreciate it because of the great difficulty that he has thus far had in making up his mind on this vital and important question. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Without the least desire to be disrespectful to the President of the United States, I think I can say that a great many of the American people are in doubt as to what kind of a program he has for bringing about disarmament, or whether indeed he has any program at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. May I have five minutes more, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Calling attention to the signatures of 37 Members of another body to a round robin telling President Wilson the kind of a treaty he could negotiate, the gentleman forgot to say that the Members of that other body are jointly responsible with the President for any treaty that may be negotiated.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, no; it is not their function to negotiate treaties. The Constitution says that the President shall negotiate treaties.

Mr. KETCHAM. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. BLACK. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate; but can the gentleman recall any instance in all of the more than 100 years of our history where the Senate of the United States has sought to direct the President by a round robin as to how he should negotiate a treaty?

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit the statement, the authority of the President to negotiate treaties without consulting the Senate is too well established to admit of any misunderstanding, and the precedent was set up by the Senate itself against the predilection of the Chief Executive. I had occasion to look up that very question some time ago. I found that for several years after the adoption of the Constitution there was some difference of opinion as to the proper procedure in making treaties. Some few held to the view that the provision of Article II giving the President power to make treaties "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" gave to the Senate equal power in negotiation with the President. This theory, however, seems to have been completely dissipated by the action of the Senate itself during the consideration of one of the first treaties, which happened to be a treaty with the Creek Indians. During the month of August, 1789, President Washington, in company with Gen. Knox, went before the Senate and presented data for this Creek treaty. He told the Senate he was calling on them for "advice and consent" in formulating this document, but after a sharp debate the Senate refused to join the President in these negotiations. The situation became very much strained. After a short pause ensued the President felt that there was nothing left for him to do but withdraw his presence from the Senate, and he absented himself in an impatient and discontented mood, never again to present a treaty to the Senate except for ratification after he had completed negotiations.

Thus, by its own act, the Senate abdicated all right to take part in the negotiation of treaties and established the precedent for the conduct of such negotiations by the Executive alone and the presenting of the treaty to the Senate for ratification after final negotiation and the signatories had been affixed, which precedent, I understand, has been strictly adhered to down to the present day.

Mr. BLACK. I thank the gentleman. I think that it is generally understood by everybody that it is the constitutional function of the President to negotiate treaties and of the Senate to ratify or reject them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLACK. If the gentleman will permit, I regret I can not do so just now. I want to call attention to another matter, and my time is short. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] also in very eloquent language assailed the amendment of my colleague, and among other things he said:

Every great nation knows that the President is desirous of securing a reduction or limitation of armaments. He has told us so over and over again.

I will admit the correctness of one of the gentleman's statements, and that is that the President has told us so over and over again, but the trouble about it is that we have got no further than the telling, and the time has come when the American people want something done on this important question. It is their backs that are bending beneath the intolerable load, and it is they who demand some relief. Oh, yes; the President has told us time and time again. He has been very versatile in his several positions on the League of Nations and the association of nations' question.

It might be interesting at this time to notice what some of his different attitudes have been. When President Wilson brought back the treaty from France and submitted it to the Senate for ratification or rejection, Mr. Harding, then a Senator from Ohio, was numbered with the mild reservationists and voted with them. He next joined forces with the Lodge reservationists, and wound up by supporting the Knox resolution providing for a separate peace with Germany. And then, after he was nominated as President upon the Republican ticket, in his speech of acceptance he again proposed a separate peace with Germany and the forming of some new world relationship, in which he would lead the way. Then, on August 28, he proposed an entirely new plan, and said, "We will resurrect The Hague Tribunal and we will put teeth in that." Then we all remember that memorable speech at Des Moines, Iowa, on October 7, in which he said:

I don't want to clarify these obligations. I want to turn my back on them. It is not interpretations I want, but rejection.

That is what he said then. Now, that was clear enough for anybody, so far as announcing a negative policy was concerned, but it did not give us anything affirmative. It pointed out no way by which we could travel the road of peaceful cooperation to a real, sure-enough disarmament. It is action now that we want. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, there are other evidences of the vagueness and indefiniteness of the President's policy on this important question which I had intended to point out, but I will not ask for any further extension of time, and thank the committee for its attention.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can reach an agreement for limiting the debate on this.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Suppose we have half an hour on a side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think that will be satisfactory.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman from Michigan will allow me, my statement of my willingness to assent to half an hour has provoked so many objections from those around me that I know we would like to have more than half an hour on this side, and I suggest to the gentleman, therefore, that I think we have nothing else we can take up to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; the Army bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Unless we can take up the Army bill. This is a very important question. The debate on this subject will finish the discussion upon the naval appropriation bill, and we can conclude its consideration in 15 minutes after we pass this section. I will ask the gentleman if

he does not think we ought to give a little more time to the discussion of it?

Mr. UPSHAW. An hour on a side.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What does the gentleman from South Carolina suggest?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman agree to an hour on a side?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I should like to know how much time remains on this matter under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that all time upon the amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I did state, as I think the House will recall, that I would be generous when we reached this item, and I am inclined to think that half an hour on a side would comply with that statement; but in view of what the gentleman from South Carolina says, perhaps 45 minutes on a side may be sufficient, and I ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 45 minutes on a side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will not the gentleman give us an hour on this side? I remember distinctly the statement of the chairman in general debate that he would be very liberal when it came to this section of the bill, and as a matter of fact the consideration of the bill has not consumed a great deal of the time of the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In view of the gentleman's request I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto conclude in two hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto conclude in two hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Reserving the right to object in order to make an inquiry, may I ask whether it would be in order, should consent be given, to offer an amendment to be voted on without debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that amendments would be in order to the pending amendment at the close of debate.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. This is the point that I have in mind: There may be gentlemen who desire to offer additional amendments to the paragraph under consideration, and when will those amendments be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment pending, and there can be another amendment offered, and a substitute. Additional amendments may be offered and voted on at the end of debate but may not be debated.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman if we can not agree in the event that this arrangement is made, that at the expiration of the time further amendments may be offered and passed on without debate?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If unanimous consent is given and the time is divided between the two gentlemen, will the debate be under the five-minute rule, or can either gentleman yield more than five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that gentlemen can yield the time as they see fit.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that in all probability the five-minute rule on this side will be observed. That would be the reasonable course to pursue.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, so that there may be a clear understanding in reference to amendments, after the pending amendment is voted up or down, after the pending amendment is disposed of, additional amendments under the rule are in order, and it would be in order for any gentleman to offer an amendment, but he would not have a chance to debate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is correct. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will not the chairman increase the time on this side to an hour and five minutes?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. For what reason?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I have been elected member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I have not been able to get five minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the regular order. The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is called for. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I make the point, Mr. Chairman, that it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been rejected, and it is too late to withdraw the objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Moore of Virginia: Page 43, line 21, after the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That the sum of \$50,000 of this appropriation may be used, in the discretion of the President, to defray the expenses of any conference that may be called under authority vested in him by existing law with a view to bringing about an agreement for the abatement of the naval programs and the curtailment of naval construction by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is legislation providing for using a part of this appropriation for another purpose.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like an opportunity to state to the House that there is no purpose in this amendment or in the amendment I offered day before yesterday—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that the appropriation which the gentleman seeks to amend is for construction, and he seeks to divert a part of that fund for a different purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is addressing himself to the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I was about to say that the simple purpose of the amendment is to secure an expression from the House indicating its approval of an effort to bring about disarmament by having a conference called in which the nations that are able to adopt an effective disarmament policy will participate. Gentlemen on the other side, as well as gentlemen on this side, will understand that I had no thought on Tuesday when I offered another similar amendment, and have no thought now of embarrassing the President. The President is assumed to be in favor of accomplishing disarmament if it can be done. That is likewise the sentiment of the country, as we believe. It is probably also the fact that the House is of the same mind. Now, my desire is that if we can do it, if a parliamentary method of doing it can be found, is to have the House, which is more strictly representative of the people than the other branch of the legislative department of the Government, proclaim to the country its deep and practical interest in the matter. That surely can not in any manner embarrass the President.

Now, so far as the point of order is concerned, I have only this to say: Here is an appropriation submitted covering several items aggregating \$90,000,000. There is already one proviso touching the use of the appropriation. My amendment suggests an additional proviso authorizing the President, in his discretion, to expend \$50,000 of the \$90,000,000 for the purpose specified. It is a purpose contemplated by existing law. The President now has the power to call an international conference, and so the amendment rests on existing law. On the question of germaneness I do not see how there can be any doubt. The appropriation relates to the matter of naval construction, and that is the very subject to which the amendment relates.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] is clearly not a limitation. It proposes an appropriation for a purpose entirely different and distinct from that provided for by the paragraph. The amendment is, therefore, not germane.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to wander for a moment from the point of order, as did my genial friend from Virginia, may I say that we all know there is a general sentiment in the country in favor of a reduction of armaments. There is a general, I may say a practically unanimous, sentiment in this House favorable to the consideration by an international conference of the questions relating to and looking toward the reduction of the burdens of war and of armaments. For many reasons it is entirely proper and fitting that the United States should inaugurate, propose, and suggest

at the proper time a gathering of the nations for the consideration of these questions. I am hopeful that in the near future, I trust during this session of Congress, those who are directly charged with responsibility in the matter of our foreign relations will find that the time is ripe and opportune for the successful accomplishment of the purposes of those who desire a lightening of military burdens, and that at that time the Congress may take appropriate action proposing and providing for the calling of an international conference on the reduction of armaments. That should be done, and I have no doubt that it will be done when the conditions of our foreign relationships is such that we can do it without any misunderstanding of our motives and with the greatest probability and assurance of a successful outcome. But we do not get an expression of the views of the House on this subject by these various amendments even if they are not subject to a point of order, because none of them reaches the proposition of disarmament in a practical way. I take the same position in regard to these matters I did in the last Congress.

When the time arrives, when the situation touching our foreign affairs is such as to make it opportune and proper, and the state of affairs in the world are such as will be likely to make our efforts successful, we then should act, and I have no doubt action will, in that event, be taken by this House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is the gentleman aware that in 1913 we enacted a statute which provided that hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international conference, congress, or like event without first having specific authority of law to do so, and that the only authority is that contained in the Hensley resolution, which is limited to the conclusion of the war in Europe?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman had listened with a little more care to what I have just said, I think he would not have fallen into the error of supposing that I had in mind initial action on the part of the Executive in this matter.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I understood the gentleman to say that the President had authority under the law to do it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from New York the other day asked me if I believed that the President did not have a right to call such a conference, except or under the Hensley resolution, and having in mind the legislation which the gentleman has just referred to, I expressed some doubt with regard to it. What I have just said was this, that I hope in the near future, I trust during this session of Congress, it may be apparent to us and to those who are most directly charged with responsibility in the matter of foreign affairs that the time is ripe for the Congress to take action suggesting and proposing a conference on disarmament. At such a time I think the Congress should act, and I have no doubt Congress in due and proper time will act. This is hardly the time, I think gentlemen on both sides will admit, to take further action in that direction, in view of the authority the President now has. In any event under a proper construction of the rules one can not place upon a naval appropriation bill, if the proposition is contested, any amendment that would be practically helpful in bringing about a settlement of this question.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I agree to that, that it would be subject to the point of order, but the gentleman says that some time during the present session of Congress—

Mr. MONDELL. I hope so.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is a very indefinite statement. The session, as we all believe, will continue until fall. What I want to know is, can the gentleman tell us whether or not he is going to allow consideration of the Rogers resolution on this floor when it is reported?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this is no doubt an interesting discussion, but it does not affect the point of order.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think the House would like to know whether it is going to have an opportunity to consider this question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not discussing the point of order. The Chair has had his attention directed to the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] has offered an amendment to follow line 21. The Clerk advised the Chair that the paragraph beginning in line 18 and ending on line 21 has not yet been read. For that reason the amendment is not now in order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, when we reach that point I shall renew the offer of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order upon the ground that the paragraph has not been read.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FISH: Page 43, after the paragraph ending at line 11, insert the following sentence: "But the President is instructed to suspend wholly or partially the expenditure of the sums aggregating \$90,000,000, specified in this and the two next succeeding paragraphs, when under his direction an agreement approved by him has been reached for the curtailment of naval construction by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, provided that nothing in the agreement entered into shall interfere with the right of the United States to maintain a Navy at least equal to that of any other power."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the paragraph to which the amendment has been offered has been passed and the amendment is not in order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 43, after the paragraph ending at line 11, insert the following—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order before it is read that the paragraph ending on line 11 has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the paragraph ending on line 11 has been passed, and it is not in order to offer an amendment to it at this time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, let the gentleman offer it at the proper place.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, after the paragraph ending at line 21 and after the word "for"—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the paragraph has not yet been read. [Laughter.] The Clerk will read.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KINDRED. I move to strike out the last word, and offer the following amendment without debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 17, after the words "thirty-three millions of dollars," insert the words "provided that \$15,000,000 of this sum shall be expended on armor and armament in the Brooklyn, N. Y., Navy Yard."

[Laughter.]

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total increase of the Navy heretofore authorized, \$90,000,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation can be expended except on vessels now being constructed or heretofore contracted for.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Page 43, line 21, after the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That the sum of \$50,000 of this appropriation may be used, in the discretion of the President, to defray the expenses of any conference that may be called under authority vested in him by existing law with a view to bringing about an agreement for the abatement of the naval programs and the curtailment of naval construction by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not germane; that it is legislation unauthorized by law.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, on that I desire to be heard. In order to determine the question of germaneness, you have to take lines 15 to 21, inclusive, because it covers the vessels which have been authorized heretofore. I think the gentleman from Michigan will agree to that—that that is the substantive proposition covered by this particular paragraph, vessels which have been authorized heretofore. Now, the gentleman seeks to allocate a portion of this fund for the expense of a provision that was included in an act which authorized this program for which we are making appropriation. In other words, he wants to pay the expense of a conference that was authorized in the same act and in the same paragraph that authorized this new construction. Now, I submit that it is germane. The gentleman from Wyoming suggested a moment ago that it was not a limitation. It does not have to be a limitation, because there is no question of its being authorized by law. If it was not authorized by law, in order for it to come in and be in order, it would have

to be a limitation or a decrease of expenditures, but in this instance it simply allocates a portion of a fund for the purpose of defraying the expenses of an authorization contained in the original authorization for this construction work.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if I may suggest, the mere fact that the Hensley amendment was part of the bill providing for certain naval construction certainly does not make this amendment in order. Furthermore, coming back to that much-discussed Hensley amendment, this amendment, if it were germane, does not provide for such a meeting or conference as the Hensley amendment contemplated. It proposes a conference of certain nations of the world rather than of all the nations of the world as provided for in the Hensley amendment, so any effort to bring it under the Hensley amendment is futile.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MONDELL. And, furthermore, it is an attempt to divert a fund proposed to be appropriated for one purpose to an entirely different use and purpose, and it is not germane as an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I interrupt the gentleman from Wyoming?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I can hardly think that the gentleman from Wyoming contends, whatever legislation has been or may be enacted, that it is possible to prevent the President of the United States from exercising his constitutional power in dealing with international affairs to convene a conference. Congress could not conceivably interfere with the authority of the President in that respect.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from South Carolina read a statute a moment ago which he apparently thought was purposed to prevent the calling of conferences without a specific authorization and appropriation by the Congress. Whatever the effect of that statute may be, it is true that whether or not the President has power and authority to call conferences, either under the Hensley resolution or without the Hensley resolution, when the Congress calls upon and directs the President to do a certain thing the Congress in so doing is legislating. When it does that the Congress legislates. It may be legislating without necessity or real practical purpose; notwithstanding, it is legislating, or attempting to do so, and legislation on an appropriation bill is repugnant to the rule unless it reduces expenditure.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman in his concluding remarks is not discussing the question that I tried to propound. He is discussing the other question, and the only question I think that is for the Chair to decide is whether this amendment is a legislative provision that is inadmissible. Of course that is the question at issue on which the Chair has to pass. I can never subscribe to the doctrine that we could tie the hands of the President of the United States by any legislation so as to prevent his calling an international conference.

Mr. MONDELL. Without passing on that question—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] offers an amendment to the paragraph, lines 18 to 21, which provides:

That the sum of \$50,000 of this appropriation may be used in the discretion of the President, to defray the expenses of any conference that may be called under authority vested in him by existing law with a view to bringing about an agreement for the abatement of the naval program, and the curtailment of naval construction, by the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan.

The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane and therefore not in order upon this bill. It is true, as has appeared previously during the discussion of points of order upon this and other parts of the bill, that the Hensley amendment, so-called, did authorize the President to call a conference of all the great nations and appoint nine commissioners to represent the United States, and carried an appropriation of \$200,000 for the salaries and expenses of such conference, the conference to consider the question of setting up an international tribunal, and also to report recommendations with reference to the reduction of armament. This amendment seeks to make available an appropriation made for the increase of the Navy, in the discretion of the President, for other purposes. The amendment proposed, which is to make available \$50,000 of the total appropriations of ninety million for increase in the Navy for the expenses of a conference or negotiations between the nations named, namely, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, in the opinion of the Chair is a matter not germane to a naval appropriation, notwithstanding the fact that the subject of the conference may have to do with and might affect the naval program of the countries concerned. That is a matter that might be germane in another appropriation bill, but is not germane to a paragraph

making appropriations for the increase of the Navy in a naval appropriation bill.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FISH: Page 43, after the paragraph ending at line 21, after the word "for" add the following: "That the President is authorized to suspend or curtail at his discretion wholly or partially the expenditures aggregating \$90,000,000 specified in this and the two preceding paragraphs."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My recollection is that the Chair has already passed on one before that is exactly like that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he has not passed on any amendment reading as this amendment reads.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation, and is no limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order against the amendment of the gentleman from New York that it is new legislation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] desire to be heard?

Mr. FISH. "The gentleman from New York" relies with confidence on the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that in order that I may repeat some of the remarks I made just now on the law on this subject, because there has been misunderstanding about it.

In 1913 there was inserted in the deficiency bill when it was in the Senate an amendment, which was agreed to in conference and which is now the law. It provides that:

Hereafter—

I ask you to note that, so that it can not be argued, as it has been to me quite recently, that it was for the life only of the appropriation bill. The language is:

Hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international congress, conference, or like event, without first having specific authority of law to do so.

Now, in the Hensley resolution, which was a part of the Navy bill for the fiscal year 1916, and was therefore enacted some time prior to 1916, it is provided:

In view of the premises, the President is authorized and requested to invite, at an appropriate time, not later than the close of the war in Europe, all the great Governments of the world, to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of formulating a plan for a court of arbitration or other tribunal.

So, the language of the Hensley resolution provides that the authority of the President shall continue only until such time as there shall be a close of the war in Europe. Manifestly we did not have in contemplation the formal declaration of peace between the United States and Germany, because we were not then at war with Germany. It was in 1915. It referred only—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman pardon me?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is August 16.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Well, it was an amendment to the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1916, and therefore must have been in 1915. But, accepting the statement of the gentleman that it was 1916, it would make no difference, as we did not enter the war until 1917. So, manifestly the only war we had in mind at that time was the war in Europe between the belligerents then engaged. Therefore, so far as the statutory authority is concerned, the President of the United States to-day has no authority. The only authority he could have would be the authority he would have through the treaty-making provisions of the Constitution. If that be the case, when we talk of the President calling a conference we ought to realize that the President may well say, "Under the statutes as they stand to-day I have not the power to call a conference of this kind. Before I call a conference, in view of this statute, I want specific authority. I want Congress to give me that authority." I am satisfied he will do so. Then, why hesitate about giving him the authority?

I do not say you should give it upon this appropriation bill, because I realize, if points of order are made, under the rules of the House it is almost impossible to grant authority that will enable him to carry out our wishes. But here is the Rogers resolution which takes into consideration the very statute I have referred to. It provides:

That the authority of Congress required by the act approved in March, 1914, is hereby granted for the purpose aforesaid, namely, the calling of the congress.

Passing this resolution now can not embarrass the President in the conduct of our foreign affairs, because it does not direct him to call the conference immediately but simply authorizes

him to do it at an appropriate time, and leaves to him the decision of not only the time but also whether he shall invite only Great Britain, France, and Japan or also other nations of the world. Why not bring this resolution in now and pass it and give this authority to the President, so that if the psychological moment arrives in the next few days or the next few weeks when he thinks with his knowledge of foreign affairs he can successfully accomplish it with a convening of a congress for the purpose, he can call it, instead of having to come to Congress and ask for a resolution which may be sent over separately and be delayed in the Senate?

The time to do it is now. You have got the resolution, and I hope the majority party in this House, charged with the responsibility, will give the Executive this power, so that he can exercise it and thus carry out the will of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Does the gentleman think there is any way in which a valid agreement can be made between the United States and any other nation with reference to disarmament except by treaty?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am frank to say to the gentleman that I have doubt as to why this legislation was passed. I have looked into the Record to see if there was a debate—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have looked into the Record to see if there was any debate in the Senate when this amendment was offered in explanation, and find there was none. But that statute being in effect, my own opinion is that your President is going to say, in the face of it, that he is not going to call that conference; and that being so, why not be specific and give him the authority now?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Is there any doubt now in the gentleman's mind that this Government of ours can only make an agreement by treaty?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I think not. I looked for the debate in the Senate to see what justification they had for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If that is true, that we can only make an agreement by a treaty, is it possible that any statute that we might enact would prohibit the President from taking any further steps necessary to bring about such an agreement, which would be a treaty?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Only this, that I know that the President would have to come to Congress to ask Congress for the money, for instance, to enable this congress to meet here. That was evidently the purpose of the Congress when it put that amendment into the deficiency bill, to provide against continued invitations to all manner of conferences to be held here at the expense of the people. It was to put restrictions on that practice which had grown up and which still exists, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, inasmuch as that statute still continues in force, that the President is not going to call a conference without specific authority. I think that is the opinion of the majority leader. He has expressed his desire to cooperate with the legislative branch of the Government and will not, in my opinion, call a conference without specific authority in view of this expressed view of the Congress that he should not do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, just one moment to repeat what I have already said. I do not think there is any doubt about the sentiment of the American people or the sentiment of this Congress on this subject.

Personally, I am willing to leave this matter to the good judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, confident that they will keep in touch with the foreign situation as it affects the United States and in constant communication with those who are most directly charged with the responsibility relative to our foreign relations, and at a time which seems opportune, with the full understanding thus secured and obtained, I have no manner of doubt what action will be taken.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The trouble is that you gentlemen want, apparently, to have the credit of being a little more anxious

than the rest of us to do something just at this time, whether it is sound or otherwise, whether or not it is sane or sensible. You say, "Let us do something," to stir up things.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman refers to what the Committee on Foreign Affairs would do. That committee was called in session last Monday for the purpose of considering this very proposition. That meeting was called off and indefinitely postponed. Can the gentleman tell me why that meeting was so indefinitely postponed?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, not being a member of the committee, having had nothing to do with its postponement, of course I am not in a position to inform the gentleman otherwise than to say that I am very confident that it was postponed for some very good and sufficient reason. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLOOD. Does not the gentleman think that gives us very slight hope of getting action by the Foreign Affairs Committee in the near future?

Mr. MONDELL. No, Mr. Chairman. I am very much surprised, in view of the apparent impetuosity and anxiety of some of the gentlemen on the other side in regard to this matter, that they did not get after it—perhaps I should not use that term—that they did not importune the former President, during the long period in which he had authority, to call this conference, a conference on disarmament; that they did not insist on his doing it. I dare say none of them ever approached the "throne of administration" to make that suggestion during all the months that elapsed from the enactment of the Hensley provision down to the 4th of March last.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. The war was on at that time. We were in the war soon after that. It was not wise or possible to hold a conference on disarmament until after the war ended.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not blaming the gentleman for not moving in it. I do not think it would have been wise for the President to have called such a conference during any part of that period, and therefore when the gentlemen restrained themselves they were exercising most excellent judgment, and if they will continue to exercise good judgment and further restrain themselves until the posture and condition of our foreign affairs make it fitting and proper to do this thing, it will be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is entirely right about the President not acting under the Hensley resolution, because the condition of affairs in the world would not have justified it. But during the last session of Congress the gentleman from Wyoming was the majority leader of the House. A member of the majority party, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Brooks], introduced a resolution requesting the President to call just such a conference as this, a conference on disarmament. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, which, as the gentleman from Wyoming said, is charged with our foreign relations, reported that resolution. It came here and was on the calendar of the House. In the wisdom of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House the time when this Government should move in this great question of disarmament had arrived. The gentleman was the leader of his party. His party was in power. It controlled this House and determined what bills should be taken up and enacted into legislation. No effort was made by the gentleman or by any member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or any member of his party, to get that resolution before the House and make the request of the President to call a conference of the nations of the world on disarmament. That resolution was killed by the majority, as the pending resolution is being killed to-day.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman understands my attitude on that matter. I did not think the proposition was wise at the time. The same reasons that control me now controlled me then. I did not think the time was opportune. The resolution was voted down by a very decided majority. The House exercised very good and excellent judgment about the matter.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman had stated that he was willing to trust the decision of this question to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. That committee, after protracted hearings upon the Brooks resolution, reported that resolution to the House. I am not speaking of the disarmament amendment

offered to the naval bill but of the Brooks resolution, a clear-cut disarmament resolution, requesting the President to call a conference of all the important nations of the earth to consider this mighty question. It represented the best judgment on this subject of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The gentleman's party then, after they had gotten the advice of the Foreign Affairs Committee, did not think it wise to request this conference. They did not permit the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or any member of that committee, to call up that resolution and get it passed by the House, giving this authority to the President. They knew that if the President had been so requested that such a conference would be called, and they would not permit the resolution to become law. You knew that this country was demanding that some step be taken toward disarmament. You knew that the world was demanding it. Yet you sat here and, through your steering committee and your leadership of this House, refused to give the President authority to call a conference to consider this great question. You are doing the same thing to-day. You are postponing it. You are leaving it to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and if the judgment of that committee accords with your wishes you will leave it with the committee to die there, but if its judgment is that this conference ought to be called and a disarmament resolution is brought in here you will throttle it and let it die on the calendar. You will not let it come up here for a vote. The people of the country will hold you responsible for the defeat of this resolution and the delay of this proposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Chair please state what is before the committee? I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I dislike to move to close debate, but there is other business scheduled to follow this bill immediately.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes, and that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] may have three minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] the other two minutes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have an amendment which I desire to explain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the intention of the majority party as to passing the Rogers resolution and calling this conference, but there seems to have been a very sudden change of heart on Monday last. I received notice last week to attend a hearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee on Monday. That hearing was to be held at 10.30, and the committee was to hear persons upon the question of the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS]. I attended, and no one was present. I said to the clerk of the committee, "I thought we were to have hearings this morning." He replied, "Yes; I did, too, but they have been postponed." I said, "It seems to me I was entitled to some notice that they had been postponed, because I go home on Saturdays, and I would not have so hurried and left other work except for this committee meeting." He said, "I received notice of the postponement only awhile ago myself, and I called up the different members of the committee." Evidently somebody had a very quick change of heart as to the amendment. As I was leaving, one of the reporters met me and said, "Are you not to have hearings on the Rogers amendment this morning?" I said, "No." He said, "When are you to have them?" I said, "I am not of the majority party; that is a foolish question."

That reminds me of the little girl who asked her mother where the light goes when it goes out. Her mother said, "My dear, that is a very foolish question. You might just as well ask me where your papa goes when he goes out." [Laughter.]

I sincerely hope that Congress will soon adopt the Rogers resolution or some other resolution providing a conference of the nations for the purpose of disarmament. I am in favor, however, until such an agreement can be obtained, of providing an adequate Army and Navy for the protection and defense, if necessary, of America. It would be criminal, indeed, to allow the country again to become unprepared. For that reason I do

hope and pray that a way will soon be found for disarmament and lifting of the burden from the backs of the American people. The tax burden is now intolerable; it bears upon the people of our country and of the world until they are all but crushed with the tremendous weight.

A vast part of the world is to-day totally bankrupt. The money of European countries has so depreciated in value that it buys a very little of the necessities of life. When I was in Europe last year I received in German marks 33 for \$1, whereas before the war one received about 4. In Austria I received 180 crowns, whereas before the war only 5 were received for \$1. Poland was worse than Germany, and the Russian money has become worthless. The American people look to this Congress for relief, and the world for us to lead them into some path which will relieve their burdens.

It is not my desire to in any way hamper the President in his actions, but I do hope that the situation of our country and of the world may speed progress in disarmament and thereby lessen the absolute demands for preparedness. The American people are with the President in this movement, and the world looks to America. Our appropriations for the fiscal year of 1920 amounted to \$5,686,005,706; 1 per cent for public welfare, 3 per cent for public works, 3.2 per cent for administration of the Government, and 92.8 per cent for war and the expense of past wars—present armaments 25 per cent, past wars, 67.8 per cent. The taxation for the Federal Government for the fiscal year averaged \$50 per person, of which 50 cents per person was spent for research education and development. When one realizes this tremendous burden, it can well be understood from whence and why cometh this great call for some agreement for disarmament or partial disarmament and the relief of the peoples of the world from all this unnecessary and unwholesome taxation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 20, after the word "constructed," strike out the word "or" and all of line 21.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, at present the proviso with reference to this \$90,000,000 appropriation reads as follows:

No part of this appropriation can be expended except on vessels now being constructed or which have heretofore been contracted for.

The effect of this amendment is to strike out the language "heretofore been contracted for," so that the proviso would read:

No part of this appropriation can be expended except on vessels now being constructed.

The argument that has been made all along is that the vessels under construction would be a greater loss to the Government if it stopped the construction than it would to go on and finish the construction. But it seems to me that if they have merely been contracted for they can well afford to wait until the determination of whether or not we are going to have an international agreement for disarmament. At any rate, the argument can not be made that it would cost the Government more to stop now than it would to finish the work, unless they are making an enormous profit on some of these ships. If you adopt my amendment, it would permit the finishing of the construction of any ships of any kind or character the construction of which has already begun.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is no money carried in this bill contemplated to be spent on any ship on which construction has not begun.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then, what is the objection to this amendment?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not know that there is any objection, but I see no particular purpose in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of any sum appropriated by this act shall be used for any expense of the Navy Department at Washington, D. C., unless specific authority is given by law for such expenditure.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCLINTIC: Page 43, line 25, after the word "expenditure," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Navy shall ascertain from the Secretary of War information concerning surplus supplies of ordnance, food sup-

plies, or other materials available for sale, and he is hereby directed to give preference to the War Department in making purchases when suitable supplies can be obtained."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will reserve it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, there is to be found at a great many military posts large stores of surplus material. There is likewise to be found in many of the stores in every city throughout the country supplies of surplus foodstuffs that have been sold by the War Department at a very low price. Much of this could have been purchased by the Navy Department at a great saving of money. I find on page 16 of this bill that the sum of \$2,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of manufacturing smokeless powder. The Members of Congress who have kept up with the activity of the Surplus Supply Division of the War Department and who have read the bulletins issued from time to time for the sale of these supplies will remember that nearly everything under the sun has been offered for sale at a very low price.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order; the gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not discussing the point of order; the point of order is reserved.

Mr. KING. If the gentleman wants to make a speech, let him extend his remarks.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that some Members of the House are not competent to interpret an amendment of this kind. The gentleman was either asleep or ignorant of what is going on.

Mr. KING. I am probably as good an authority on that matter as is the gentleman on the purity of the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois made the point of order that the gentleman from Oklahoma was not discussing the point of order. The point of order was simply reserved by the gentleman from Michigan, and the gentleman from Oklahoma was recognized to speak on his amendment.

Mr. KING. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I did not yield for that purpose, Mr. Chairman. I had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not obliged to discuss the point of order now. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I was discussing the amendment which I offered in good faith. The gentleman belongs to the party that has promised the country economy. The amendment I have offered calls the attention of the Secretary of the Navy to the fact that it is possible to purchase surplus supplies from the War Department at a much lower price than can be purchased at other places. In other words, I am trying to cut out much duplication in buying and at the same time reduce the expenditures authorized in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is clearly legislation, authorizing the various officers to perform certain duties, and the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and that no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit, for a sum less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: Page 44, line 20, insert: "and that all orders or contracts for the manufacture of material pertaining to approved projects heretofore or hereafter placed with Government-owned establishments shall be considered as obligations in the same manner as provided for similar orders placed with commercial manufacturers, and the appropriations shall remain available for the payment of the obligations so created as in the case of contracts or orders with commercial manufacturers."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. I have not had time to look into it at all or study the full meaning of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order against the amendment. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard upon the amendment?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to this fact: The other day I asked the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in regard to how much money carried in this bill was to be expended by private corporations. The gentleman was unable to say. Since that time I have been trying to find out how much of the money that we spend for national defense goes to corporations to foster industry to make war on other people. No one is able to answer the question. I have taken the matter up in the Military Affairs Committee and we tried to stop the practice, as far as possible, in the Army. This same amendment has been held in order on Army bills, and it is in the present Army appropriation bill, word for word, as I offer it. It is also in the Army reorganization bill as permanent legislation in such a way as I think to cover the entire subject, as that was a national defense measure. However, they offer as an excuse the fact that the appropriation was not available, owing to the fact that we have not put that amendment on the naval appropriation bill. I offer the amendment to reduce the expenses of this Government and to have, as far as possible, the money that we appropriate used in the navy yards and not used by private corporations which foster the industry of making war. I have a letter from the Navy Department in regard to a contract that was let a few days ago by the Navy Department, which I will read:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1921.

MY DEAR MR. DARROW: Your letter of April 20 requesting information concerning the award of contract for 14-inch and 16-inch proof shot has been received.

While the navy yard was the low bidder on 14-inch proof shot only, the time of delivery, 13 months, rendered it impossible to give even that part of the order to the yard, because it would have necessitated using next year's money, which is going to be very scarce. Money is available from this year's current appropriation, "Ordnance and ordnance stores," and can only be used after July 1 if obligated by contract prior to that date. Placing an order with a navy yard is not "obligating" it under law, though such is the case with Army appropriations.

I think that the employees of the navy yard who called on you have already been informed regarding this matter, and am sorry that they took up your time unnecessarily. I am always glad to furnish information and hope you will not hesitate to call upon me. As a former commandant, I am greatly interested in the employees of the Washington Navy Yard, who form a very efficient body.

Very sincerely, yours,

CHAS. B. McVAY, JR.,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

HON. G. P. DARROW, M. C.,
Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

It is very clear that if this amendment be adopted it will reduce expenses, and it is clearly in order under the Holman rule. There ought not to be any objection to the amendment on the part of this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Is that the law now regarding the military appropriations?

Mr. HULL. Certainly. It is permanent law, and it should be on the naval appropriation bill. It is a reflection on the Naval Committee and on the naval administration that they have not had it put on their bill long ago.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in connection with this amendment that it may be all right. I do not know. But it is a matter of considerable importance, rather far-reaching in its effect, and, representing the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa can readily see that I can not permit a matter of so much importance, which is clearly subject to the point of order, to go into the bill. In view of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has given the matter no consideration whatever, nor have I myself, that the Secretary of the Navy has not been consulted, and that we have had no communication whatever from the Navy Department with reference to it, I reluctantly am obliged to object. Personally, I do not think the navy yards are suffering at all for want of work. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HULL. For only a few minutes. The Chairman understands the Holman rule, and any legislation which will reduce expenses is clearly in order. This is reducing expenses, according to the department's own statement. What is wanted any clearer than that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that an amendment must show on its face that it reduces expenses, and the

Chair would ask the gentleman from Iowa in what way the amendment reduces expenses and what particular language explains the result in the reduction.

Mr. HULL. Take it in connection with the preceding section. If they can manufacture for less than they can purchase, they can use the appropriation. That is what it means. It has been held in order on the Army bill, and how does it differ in that respect when it is offered on a Navy bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would further suggest that it is not germane to the paragraph to which it is offered. The paragraph to which it is offered deals with quite another matter.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any question but that the adoption of this amendment is a saving on the appropriation bill for the Navy Department. I think no one can question that to-day in the Navy Department there is a great opportunity for the saving of money in the repairing and the building of ships for the Navy. There is not a navy yard in the country to-day where there is not already established some branch for the manufacture of supplies and machinery for the Navy Department. Yet almost invariably you find officers in charge going outside and purchasing supplies at a much higher price than the Navy Department can manufacture them for in their own yards. I will give you one example to show where the saving would come right under this amendment. For years the Navy Department has been making at the navy yard in my district the chain used on the battleships and the cruisers. There has never been an objection to that chain as it has been manufactured, and it has been supposed until recently to be the best chain that could be procured. But suddenly, at the instigation of some officer, they have decided to use a different make of chain, and that chain is to be purchased from a private corporation, at an expense far in excess of that for which the navy yards can make the same chain, even though the expense necessary to change their patterns and machinery is added to the cost. A delegation from the Boston Navy Yard came here and laid the case before the Navy Department and guaranteed to make a better chain than is now being purchased by the Navy Department at from 6 to 14 cents a pound less than the Navy Department has agreed to pay for it at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that this is a saving under the Holman rule, not only in this line of supplies, but will also apply to many others. It would be a saving to the Government of many thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars in appropriations each year. I have given this matter some study because I come in contact with the matter almost every day. I have heard men on this floor get up and complain of the efficiency of the workmen in the navy yards. Nothing could be more false than that. The Government, during the war, constructed a great many ships for the United States Shipping Board, and great efficiency was claimed for that work, which went on all over the country, but the fact remains that a great many of those ships have had to be put back into the navy yards of the United States and in private yards to be repaired because of the lack of efficiency and poor workmanship in their construction. They have been sent back to the Government navy yards because there is efficiency there and also first-class workmanship.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can manufacture supplies for the Navy in the navy yards and save money for the Government, and the adoption of this amendment would compel the use of some of these departments now lying idle. I hope the gentleman in charge of the bill will withdraw his objection to this amendment in the interest of economy that he speaks of in this bill. I believe, Mr. Chairman, its adoption would be a great saving for the Government, and the Navy Department will do the things that Congress intended should be done when we spent the millions of dollars of the Government's money in building up these institutions in the several yards.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order, I understand, has not been passed upon by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make this suggestion to the Chair: If the Chair will notice in the paragraph which was just read immediately preceding the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HULL], he will notice that it provides that where the navy yards can be made available they shall be made available. Now, this additional paragraph has only this effect: It declares that these appropriations that have already been made in certain instances for this purpose shall be continued to be available for the purposes

specified in the act. Now, that is made necessary, as was explained by my colleague from Iowa, for the reason that when it had been called to the attention of some officers of the Navy that this appropriation might be used for such purposes that they said they were not authorized. Very well. Then this would give them the necessary authorization to use the funds already appropriated. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the fund already appropriated for like purposes can be used without contracting for the same purposes with private corporations, without necessitating further expenditures and further appropriations, it seems to me that the conclusion is inevitable, Mr. Chairman, that the work necessarily effects a reduction in expenditures. It seems to me that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly clear that this amendment provides for new legislation, and it does not come within the exceptions carried in the Holman rule because it does not appear upon the face of the amendment it will necessarily retrench expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] offers an amendment to the paragraph of the bill which provides—

That all orders or contracts for the manufacture of material pertaining to approved projects heretofore or hereafter placed with Government-owned establishments shall be considered as obligations in the same manner as provided for similar orders placed with commercial manufacturers, and the appropriation shall remain available for the payment of the obligations so created as in the case of contracts or orders with commercial manufacturers.

Well, in the opinion of the Chair, that might result in a saving or it might result in a loss; there is nothing upon the face of the amendment itself to make it clear that it will result and must finally result in a retrenchment of expenditures. Furthermore, of course, it is permanent legislation and authority to the paragraph of the bill where it is offered. The Chair has carefully read the language which precedes it in conjunction with the amendment and can not hold that the amendment on its face will result in a retrenchment of expenditures, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to perfect this amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask that we return to—

Mr. BLANTON. But I have an amendment to perfect this paragraph if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 5, after the word "watch," strike out the words "or other time-measuring device"; and, in line 8, strike out "or of the movements of any such employees while engaged upon such work."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee informs us that we have employed by the United States Government in our navy yards between 60,000 and 70,000 men, and yet we are attempting by the passage of this paragraph in this bill to provide that no Government manager or superintendent of any of those yards, or of any of the work of those yards, can in any way exercise surveillance over these 60,000 or 70,000 employees to bring about efficiency. I know how the House feels on that question, because I have seen Members vote before, but I can not sit still as one Member of the House feeling as I do about it without raising my voice again in protest against any such law. Is there a business man in this House to-day who would employ personally in his private business 60,000 or 70,000 employees and not have some kind of reasonable surveillance to enforce efficient service? Are you going to do with the public money of the people in the Public Treasury something that you would not do with your own money? That is the question for you to answer. Oh, my friends, whenever this question is raised some one will jump up and say, "Are you going to hold a stop watch over somebody?" Well, I have not in this amendment raised any opposition to the stop watch; I have left that in. My amendment does not affect the stop watch, but it does affect language where you say the Government shall not exercise any kind of surveillance over its employees; that you can not overlook them at all; but that these 60,000 or 70,000 employees may do as they please. Most of them might be loyal, patriotic, deserving, efficient workmen, and yet of that whole bunch you might have at least a small number who were slackers on their work. In every job requiring the service of 60,000 or 70,000 men you will find some fellows who are not as alert as others; you will find some fellows hanging back instead of pushing forward. I think we should have some kind of surveillance. Franklin D. Roosevelt, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, testified before one of the committees that since this very provision went into effect that he was not able to get more than about 65 per cent of efficiency in the navy yards. That is in a printed document of one of your hearings, and

yet because the organizations of these men come here and demand that we pass this law, and have their representatives watch us from the gallery and watch the Record the next day from their offices in the city of Washington to see how we vote, we must, forsooth, comply with their demands. Why, they hold a stop watch over you, but they do not want you to hold a stop watch over them. [Laughter.] They give you a card when election time comes saying you have given 100 per cent of service or you have given 5 per cent of service. I know you are not going to pass my amendment, but I am going to raise a protest just the same.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This provision carried in the bill is a provision which has been carried for a long time. Sometimes the Committee on Naval Affairs reporting this bill heretofore has reported this provision, and sometimes it has not. When it has not it has been invariably inserted on the floor. So it seemed rather the settled policy of the House that this legislation should continue, and that is why the paragraph is carried in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask to return to page 17 for the consideration of an amendment which was offered, and to which a reservation of the point of order was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks to return to page 17, according to previous agreement.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. STEPHENS. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and offer another one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment offered by him when the paragraph on page 17 was reached during the reading of the bill, and to offer one in lieu thereof. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, let us have the proposed substitute read, Mr. Chairman, in order to see what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read for the information of the committee the amendment proposed to be offered in lieu of the one that has been withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEPHENS: Page 17, after line 2, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"That no part of the appropriations heretofore, herein, or hereafter made for 'increase of the Navy' under the Bureau of Ordnance, and no part of allotments of appropriations heretofore or hereafter made to said bureau shall be available for the payment for services or materials used in the construction of any shop, building, living quarters, or other structures, or for additions and betterments to any existing shore station facilities unless the appropriation shall in terms specifically authorize such construction or additions and betterments: *Provided*, That hereafter ordnance materials procured under the various ordnance appropriations shall not be available for issue, to meet the general needs of the naval service: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the allocation of guns and ammunition to ships according to the requirements of the naval service."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been read only for information. Is there objection to the gentleman withdrawing the former amendment and offering the one that has just been read? The gentleman from Ohio offered an amendment, and there was no objection to its being reported.

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that permission has been given.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, and shall not make it. That is practically the same amendment that I made the point of order to the other day, and my reason for not making the point of order to-day is not that I have changed my mind in the least regarding the appropriateness of legislating on these appropriation bills. But my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. STEPHENS] has worked hard and dug up what seems to be a very serious abuse in the department in that they appropriate materials for any old subject or purpose which they desire, without giving a rendering or accounting to the department from which they take it. And rather than to permit that to continue until the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee may possibly, perchance, some time have the opportunity and right of way on the calendar to

rectify it, I think it is wiser to submit to the legislation on the appropriation bill rather than to make a point of order against it. I therefore withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] withdraws his reservation of the point of order.

Mr. CURRY. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CURRY. That it changes existing law on an appropriation bill. While the legislation may be proper, and probably we ought to have it, it should come from the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which the gentleman from Ohio is a member, and time be given to consider it. It interferes absolutely at the present time with the system that has been in vogue in the navy yards, and without proper legislation and without telling the department what they shall or shall not do, except so far as this resolution is concerned, changes the law.

Mr. STEPHENS. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. CURRY. Yes; I will reserve it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California makes the point of order against the pending amendment.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the effect of this proposed amendment. It will require that funds appropriated shall be applied as intended; will prevent augmenting appropriations by transferring surplus money from other heads; will prevent using appropriations for armor and armament and ammunition for new ships for making betterments and additions at shore stations; will prevent the use of any unexpended balances of war appropriations, of which it is understood the bureau has a large unexpended balance to its credit of an allotment made during the war; will not interfere with the transfer of surplus material acquired during the war to other bureaus, such as machine tools; and will not interfere with the assignment of guns intended for a particular ship, in an emergency, to another ship. These are the reasons, and I think the amendment ought to carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report back to the House the bill with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 4803) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to recommit. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments, to wit: On page 43, line 11, strike out "\$53,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000"; and in line 17 strike out "\$33,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000"; and in line 19 strike out "\$90,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to recommit the bill. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays, and, pending that, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present. A quorum is present. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. As many as favor taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Not a sufficient number have risen. The yeas and nays are refused, and the motion to recommit is lost. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan and Mr. BLANTON called for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Texas ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 212, yeas 15.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. As many as favor taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Four gentlemen have risen in the affirmative, not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused. The yeas are 212 and the yeas are 15.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5010) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; and, pending that, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] about how much time he requires for general debate.

Mr. Sisson. I have requests for 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Would it suit the gentleman's convenience if we would confine the general debate to three hours, one hour and a half to each side?

Mr. Sisson. I have pared down the time on all gentlemen who have asked for time to 5 or 10 minutes, and after doing that I find it would take an hour and forty-five minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, make it three hours and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to three hours and a half, one half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, the Army appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5010, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5010) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the bill that is now presented to the House for the support of the Army for the next fiscal year has been based upon the bill which was passed by both the

House and Senate at the last session of Congress and which failed to meet the approval of the President.

There are very few changes of legislation in this bill as compared with the bill that failed. There have been increases made in the appropriation for various items, principally for pay and subsistence of enlisted men, of \$6,500,000. There have been decreases in various items for the support and maintenance of the Army of \$22,000,000, making a net reduction under the bill which failed to receive approval from the President of over \$15,000,000.

We took it that the reason that the bill which this House and the Senate agreed upon failed to receive presidential approval was because of the fact that we had not appropriated a sufficiently large sum of money to maintain an Army of the size which was desired by the War Department at that time, when the department asked for a force of 280,000 men and appropriations amounting to \$690,000,000. If that was the cause of its failure to receive presidential approval, of course the bill that is now presented to you would likewise probably fail to receive such approval, because, as I say, we have further reduced the amount carried in the old bill by \$15,000,000, although we do make an authorization for the maintenance of 10,000 more enlisted men for the Regular Army than the last bill carried. The bill which failed provided for an Army of 158,000 enlisted men and, in addition thereto, the Philippine Scouts of 6,900 and 1,200 flying cadets. This bill which now comes to the House carries an appropriation for the pay of the Army which will provide 168,000 enlisted men in the regular service and also the 6,900 Philippine Scouts and the 1,200 flying cadets, and in addition thereto we provide pay for 14,000 commissioned officers, the same as the last bill carried. There are now in the Army 12,900 commissioned officers, but, due to the liberal promotions which were caused by the act of reorganization, there are now no second lieutenants in the Army, and when part of those vacancies are filled it will absorb the entire number provided for. This bill will pay for 14,000 officers.

The first legislative change in the bill provides that surplus foodstuffs in the Army may be sold abroad. When we gave the authority in previous legislation we explicitly exempted foodstuffs from among those articles which could be sold abroad; but it has been found that there are certain articles of food that do not find ready sale in this country for which the only market is in foreign countries, and we felt that the War Department should have that authority. Only the other day the department sold 119,000,000 pounds of canned meat at the ridiculously low price of 5½ cents a pound. If they had had authority to sell those canned meats abroad, we could have received a larger sum of money for them; but the sale has been made, the canned meats are largely disposed of, but we have several million dollars' worth of what are called dehydrated vegetables, that are put up in large-sized tins, that are finding no sale in our markets for consumption among our own people, and if we are going to convert those surplus supplies into money they must be sold abroad, and this change must be made in the legislation.

There are two other new legislative provisions, one authorizing enlistment of flying cadets and another authorizing one officer of the Medical Reserve Corps to be detailed for duty beyond the 15-day training period.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman tell us how many men there will be in the Army after the 30th day of June next?

Mr. ANTHONY. That will be entirely dependent upon the policy adopted by the Secretary of War.

Mr. MILLER. With reference to the 168,000 that the bill makes provision for, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, it will be more than that, will it not?

Mr. ANTHONY. There will not be more than that if the Secretary puts in operation the provisions that are carried in this bill. I will call the attention of the gentleman now, as I intended to call the attention of the House, to the fact that the bill as it now comes before the House carries the Borah amendment, which was placed in the last bill by the Senate and agreed to by the House before in conference, which provides that not a single man more shall be carried in the Army than the money provided in this bill will pay for. That of itself will hold the Army down to 168,000 men next year.

Mr. MILLER. What will become of the excess number of soldiers? How will they be gotten rid of when they are in the Army by regular enlistment?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are now 235,000 men in the Army. While we were debating on this question during the last Congress the War Department was busily at work recruiting all

over this country, and they piled up an additional 35,000 men in the Army while Congress was trying to get the legislation through here to prevent that, and this Secretary of War has a harder problem to get rid of those men than was the case a few months ago, because we now have 235,000 men in the Army. But I will say to the gentleman that I see no obstacle in the way of discharging a sufficient number of men to get down to the number which Congress may fix.

Mr. MILLER. I am in perfect harmony with the gentleman and with the number provided in this bill, but the question with me is how are you going to get rid of these men when they are in the Army under regular enlistment authorized by law?

Mr. ANTHONY. The Secretary of War believes we should adhere to the policy of reducing the Army by the normal expiration of enlistments. If that policy is adhered to we will not be able to cut the Army down to the size that this bill provides. They will have to use some more drastic action. They will have to discharge a certain number of men, which we contend they have ample authority to do under the terms of the contract of enlistment, which provides in a perfectly plain contract that a man enlists for one or three years, as the case may be, "unless sooner discharged by the President or the Secretary of War or the commander of his Army corps." Any of those three men has authority under the terms of the enlistment contract to discharge a man, so under that contract I say the Army can be reduced as rapidly as Congress desires. Then there is another fact in that connection. There is no question but what more than 25 per cent of the enlisted men now in the service would be glad to get out of the Army if permission were given them. They would voluntarily take advantage of discharges if it was the policy of the War Department to grant them.

Before the war they used to be granted on demand and by purchase. The Secretary of War contends that he has not that authority, and this bill gives him that authority if it becomes a law.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman says that the way to reduce the Army is to reduce by voluntary act of the men in the service themselves.

Mr. ANTHONY. And through arbitrary discharges.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I did not catch the last statement. Does the gentleman say there is no authority for the Secretary of War to discharge a man on his own application.

Mr. ANTHONY. Both the last Secretary of War and the present Secretary contend that they have not that authority.

Mr. KEARNS. They have been doing that for the last 15 years, have they not?

Mr. ANTHONY. Unquestionably.

Mr. KEARNS. When did they arrive at the conclusion that the law did not justify an act of that character?

Mr. ANTHONY. I suppose it was when they found that they desired to maintain a larger army than Congress thought was necessary.

Mr. KEARNS. The present Secretary of War claims that he wants to obey the mandate of Congress.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think he does, and I think that he will carry out faithfully the provisions which Congress puts its approval upon.

Mr. KEARNS. If he believes that, why does he not grant applications for discharge from the Army?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not answer that.

Mr. KEARNS. Would not the gentleman conclude that the present Secretary of War is not in sympathy with the acts of Congress?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be frank with the gentleman. While we have had a change in the office of the Secretary of War there has been apparently no change in the military policy of the War Department. The gentleman from Ohio and I have seen many Secretaries of War come and go, but the General Staff goes on forever. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEARNS. The Secretary of War is functioning, is he not?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am sure he is, and very ably, too.

Mr. KEARNS. He does not have to follow the advice of the General Staff; everything is done in the name of the Secretary of War.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that the present Secretary of War will carry out the wishes of this Congress.

Mr. KEARNS. The Secretary of War is not following out the plan stated by the gentleman, because he is not discharging boys from the service.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true; and I think I ought to say for the information of the House that the Secretary of War has asked for a larger number of men than we authorize in

this bill. He believes that the Army should only be reduced through the normal process of the expiration of enlistment. To do that will necessitate carrying a much larger appropriation for the pay of the Army. He wanted the appropriation for pay of enlisted men and for subsistence increased over that of the last bill by \$22,000,000. He made the committee a proposition in connection with the proposed increase which is printed in our report. In substance, he said if we would make the increase of \$22,000,000 for pay and subsistence of the Army he could economize by reductions in other items for maintenance and supply of the Army of an equal amount of \$22,000,000. What the committee did was to partially grant his wish by increasing the amount for pay and subsistence about \$6,500,000 and then made the reduction which the Secretary of War thought could be made in the items for the supply of the Army. The increase thus permits the maintenance of 10,000 more men than the last bill provided.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. What number of enlisted men would that provide for?

Mr. ANTHONY. The War Department wanted an average of 183,000 men during the year. Our bill will pay for 168,000.

Mr. BRIGGS. In this connection, has it not been the gentleman's experience that the War Department has refused to discharge men from the service unless they could show urgent dependency within the provisions of Congress which authorize that without general legislation?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman is correct. The Secretary of War cited an instance the other day, in which he said there was a man from Texas who came to him who had two boys in the Army. He said that he needed the labor of the boys on his ranch very badly. The Secretary contended that under the law he had no authority to grant a discharge. I disagreed with him on this.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to say that the most rigid requirements are imposed as to dependents. The department will not accept the general statement from parents or friends, but they want to have an investigation through the Red Cross officers, to see whether or not there is such an urgent dependency, that the parents are helpless without the assistance of the son whose discharge is sought.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is the present policy of the War Department to hang onto every man. They think there is a necessity for having an Army of the size they have got, and they are not going to let any man go unless we force them to cut down.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does not the gentleman think there should be legislation to accomplish the discharge of these men?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the provisions of this bill there is no alternative but to discharge until the Army is down to 168,000.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. STEVENSON. I want to say that I have had a new ruling made on me. A boy was taken in under 17 and was in the Army eight months and his parents asked for his discharge. They not only declined to discharge him but said that the parents had waived their right to have him discharged because they had waited eight months.

Mr. ANTHONY. We have legislation in this bill that will take care of that.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I am not certain but what the gentleman has answered this question: Is there any provision in this bill which will compel the Secretary of War to reduce the Army to the number designated?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. How are the troops at the present time distributed?

Mr. ANTHONY. I have not the official information at hand, but I can tell the gentleman roughly. The troops are distributed about according to these figures: There are now 15,000 troops in Hawaii. That is 10,000 more than the normal number that we have had there, and 10,000 more than I consider to be necessary. We have 8,000 in the Canal Zone, or 5,000 more than is normally carried or necessary. We have 15,000 in the Army of occupation in Germany, and every man of them should be brought home. We have about 14,000 in the Philippine Islands and 1,200 in China.

We have 1,000 in Alaska, and about 170,000 doing garrison duty in this country. It makes a total of 232,000 men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I was not present in the Chamber when the gentleman began his remarks, but does the bill provide for the discharge of soldiers under the age of 18 upon the application of their parents or anyone who stands in loco parentis?

Mr. ANTHONY. We carry exactly the same provision that was agreed to in conference between the House and the Senate a few months ago.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman another question. I assume that the President or the officers in charge of the Army can place the Army wherever they see fit.

Mr. ANTHONY. They can.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is no legislation to prevent their distributing the Army wherever they desire?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is not.

Mr. HERRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for two questions?

Mr. ANTHONY. Certainly.

Mr. HERRICK. The first question I want to ask is this: In the event the Secretary of War does not discharge a sufficient force to bring the Army down to 168,000 men, and carries a much larger force, will not the Secretary of War, or some one in his behalf, come to the next session of Congress with a deficiency bill for us to make up the difference?

Mr. ANTHONY. That was heretofore the case in nearly every session of Congress.

Mr. HERRICK. And it is liable to be the case again?

Mr. ANTHONY. I apprehend that under the language of this bill he will not be able to do that, at least as regards pay of the Army.

Mr. HERRICK. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. ANTHONY. Because the Borah amendment is so explicit that I do not see how the War Department can come to Congress for a single additional dollar for pay; and this controls the number of men.

Mr. HERRICK. Let me ask the other question: Is there any provision in this bill to suspend the recruiting until the Army has been reduced to the stipulated 168,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. Recruiting has already been suspended, in accordance with the resolution adopted by Congress recently. The Borah amendment is at the top of page 22. It provides that the Army shall be reduced by the Secretary so that the sum appropriated shall defray the entire cost of the pay of officers and enlisted men during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As I understand it, a considerable reduction has been made in this bill from the bill we passed in the last Congress.

Mr. ANTHONY. About \$15,000,000.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Is any provision made in this bill for the purchase of land adjacent to Army posts throughout the country?

Mr. ANTHONY. None that I know of. The committee felt that, while it was not able to meet the demands of the War Department for the size of an Army that they would like to maintain, nor able to meet their estimates as to the amount of money that will be required, yet that we are making ample provision here for an Army fully large enough to meet every military requirement that may confront this country I have not the slightest doubt. We feel that we have made provision for an Army amply large for the purpose of maintaining peace and order, for defense, and for training, and to garrison our outlying possessions.

And especially with this large body of commissioned officers that Congress has authorized, and we now have a body of over 12,000 of the most efficient and best trained officers the world has ever seen, we feel that we are building for preparedness for the future which amply insures our Military Establishment from ever going below the high standard that it has now reached. This country to-day from the standpoint of its tremendous stores of reserve artillery and ammunition and matériel for carrying on war, from the standpoint of the number of trained men, from the standpoint of our ability to quickly put an armed force in the field if necessary, in my opinion excels any other nation in the world. And all of this preparedness will make for future peace.

We can be, if we wish, the greatest military power. We have the facilities, we have the equipment. I hope the time will never come when we may need to use them, but we have arranged in this legislation to take ample care of such a situation, so that if it ever comes an adequate Army and this large number of highly trained officers will be ready and available.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. For how many officers does this bill provide?

Mr. ANTHONY. Fourteen thousand.

Mr. BRIGGS. The same number carried in the previous bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think the chairman of the subcommittee is to be congratulated on the bill which he has presented to this House. I know that great pressure has been brought to bear upon the chairman of the committee to make many changes in the bill, but we feel that the committee and the House did its duty in the last bill, and that the changes that have been agreed to really result in saving to the Treasury some money. Personally I do not believe the Secretary of War will be able to make good the figures that he has presented to us here, but the committee did not feel that they ought to repudiate his figures. If he says he can save money we should give him a chance. A certain amount of cheeseparing has been done on many items other than the pay of the Army. Without taking the time to give the exact figures in detail, the reductions amount in round numbers by this cheeseparing to about \$20,000,000. Something like \$6,000,000 has been added for the pay of the Army, so that there is a net reduction of something like fourteen or fifteen million dollars. This cheeseparing is to start in many quarters so that the Army can be kept at least 168,000 men.

The proposition is that we get an average of about 168,000 men. The House in the last bill, as was the committee, was thoroughly committed to the figure of 150,000 men as the number to which the Army should be reduced. That seemed to be not only the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee which considered the bill, but the opinion of the whole committee and the opinion of an overwhelming majority of this House irrespective of which side of the House they sit upon. Personally I do not like to increase the Army by 18,000 men over that figure. I do not think such an Army is needed. The contention of the Army officers is that it would take quite a while to reduce the Army from its status of from between 230,000 and 235,000 men down to that figure. I have never shared the tenderness of heart along the line that others have, because it never seemed to me that there would be very much trouble in discharging a man from the Army, though he might be somewhat disappointed because the terms of his enlistment state specifically that he may be discharged at any time. Certainly when a man's term of enlistment expires the Secretary has the right not to reenlist him.

We all know that the difference between 168,000 men and the present number in the Army would represent a considerable number of men to take out of the Army within a few days or a few weeks, but with the Borah amendment in this bill, unless my calculations are erroneous, the Secretary of War will have to act with some expedition. If not, then before the end of the fiscal year the Army will be down very much below the 168,000. In other words, if he does not discharge men within a few weeks, and begin now, the Army will go to 150,000 men, but I presume in order to avoid that the discharges will be made as rapidly as possible, so that under the amount of money granted in the bill the Army will be 168,000 men at the end of the year.

Your subcommittee, or at least a majority of it, agrees with me in the statement that this House is not committing itself to the proposition that the Army should be more than 150,000 men.

You know precedent is always a dangerous thing in government. Therefore, yielding to the complaint of the Army officers, shared in by the Secretary of War, as to the difficulty of discharging so many men because they would disorganize the Army, the committee has yielded, with the strict understanding that this is no precedent; that we are not fixing the size of the Army at 168,000 men. If I could have had my way about it, the bill would have been written so as to compel them to reduce to 150,000 men, or even below that, but the Secretary of War is surrounded by the General Staff, men of ability, men who claim technical knowledge of what we need in this country, men who talk from the standpoint of experts assuming to know exactly what we need, and talking to you about a certain number of complete units, talking to you in technical phrases of the Army, and, like most professional men, they use terms that do not always mean anything to the layman. [Laughter.]

But it has this psychological effect, that if the doctor comes to you and tells you plainly what is your malady, you are not much impressed; but if he flings in a little technical language and leaves you in a mystified mental condition on a sick bed and tells you that he is going to prescribe for that, the psychology is such that we think he is a doctor who seems to know exactly what he is doing, because he is talking to you in

learned language that you do not understand. It is like the old lady who went to hear Moody preach. When he got through she went up to congratulate Mr. Moody, and she said, "Mr. Moody, when I came to hear you preach I thought I was going to hear a big preacher, but we have got a bigger preacher who preaches to us every day, because almost every minute when he is preaching he uses some big word I do not understand, but I understood every word you said; so our preacher is a heap smarter than you are." Now, there is a great deal in that—trying to keep people mystified. Still I do not believe any good, intelligent, fair and square, forehanded Congressman is going to be fooled in that way. There can be no arbitrary number essential and necessary to an army. There is nothing expert about it, and I am getting a little tired of Congress not assuming the position of saying, "We are the bosses, we are to control the purse strings, and we are going to determine how many men we shall have in the Army, and instead of the dictation coming from a staff of Army officers the dictation shall come from the Congress, the representatives of the people, the law-making body of those people, who are responsible to the Treasury."

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. BRIGGS. What was the number of men provided in the Army bill which passed the House and Senate at the last session?

Mr. Sisson. We figured that even if the reduction were made in the first part of the year and the reduction did commence as soon as that bill passed and before the 1st of July that we could keep perhaps 155,000 men. If, however, they should wait later to reduce the number of men and let the number remain in the Army after the 1st of July, why, it would go below 155,000, below 150,000, and if we kept the men in six months before making the reduction it would go to 125,000. There is no telling how far it would go down, because under the Borah amendment they can not expend more money for pay of the Army than is provided for in this bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I do.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Under the appropriations made in the other bill, how many men would that have paid for?

Mr. Sisson. If we take the average on the 1st of July, it would pay about 155,000 men. We left a leeway of something like 5,000 men, so at the end of the year if they acted expeditiously they would have 150,000 at least.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman think that fixing the number at 168,000 will lead another body to feel that they can increase that number, perhaps?

Mr. Sisson. I do not know just what the other body may do, nobody knows, but they do know the exact position of the House, and know also the position of the subcommittee in the matter in passing practically the bill that was agreed upon in conference. That might facilitate the passage of the bill through the other body.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman think the Government would be justified in discharging a man before his enlisted period had expired providing he wanted to stay in the Army?

Mr. Sisson. Well, I must confess that personally I do not object to their discharging them at any time. There is a contention, however, that there is a contract between the soldier and the Government—

Mr. HULL. Certainly there is a contract.

Mr. Sisson. And I never believed in breaching any contract I make myself, and therefore I do not believe the Government ought to do it. But every enlistment contract with every soldier specifically provides that the Government may discharge him at any time. Under the expiration of their enlistment and those who are anxious to get out, added to them, will enable the War Department, in my judgment, to get down far below 168,000, but—

Mr. HULL. That is all well and good provided the gentleman's hypothesis were right, but he does not know, and no member of the committee knows, how many men want to get out, but with the amendment proposed in the bill this is true, that if you do not get down to 168,000 they would have arbitrarily to discharge the men.

Mr. Sisson. I think that is true.

Mr. HULL. Then you have done just what you say you do not believe in doing.

Mr. Sisson. No; I do not think that will result in doing anyone any injustice. Nor do I think any soldier has any right

to complain if he is discharged, for it is so stated in the contract.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to the gentleman he will recall the War Department figures; that if the War Department should not resort to any arbitrary discharges, if they should even refuse to discharge on the soldier's own application before the expiration of his enlistment, having the normal decrease and accepting no new enlistments, they would be at the end of the next fiscal year down to 126,516 men, including Philippine Scouts and flying cadets, or an average for the year of 174,180. Deducting from that the Philippine Scouts and flying cadets it leaves an average approximating that covered by the appropriation in the bill.

Mr. Sisson. I think, if the gentleman will pardon me, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], my colleague on the committee, has stated what will be conceded by the War Department to be the exact result of the natural expiration of enlistments and natural wastage in the Army. Therefore I say to my friend from Iowa that I think, for that reason, he is just setting up a straw man in order to knock him down.

Mr. HULL. That would be all very well if we did not have a little memory. When you had this bill up here before that same question was proposed to you, and you said that the Army would go down at the rate of 15,000 men a month. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], I think, made that statement, just as he makes it now, to the effect that the normal decrease is going to bring the Army down.

Mr. Sisson. I decline to yield further. I will state this to my friend, that I hope the Borah amendment will cause our Army officers to do what they have not been heretofore doing. They have been enlisting men as rapidly as they could and have kept the recruiting offices open all the time. What I think we ought to do is to provide in so many words that the Army on the 1st of July should not have more than 150,000 men and provide a penalty for a violation of that law. You all know that our Army officers will violate this law if they can and that you have to choke a man out of the Army.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. For a question.

Mr. HULL. I will tell you why your Army is not going down. It is because the Appropriations Committee, when they had the bill up before, would not let me put an amendment on striking out the bonus.

Mr. Sisson. I wanted to strike out the bonus as much as the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 15 minutes of time.

Mr. Sisson. I will take two or three minutes more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain the Borah amendment?

Mr. Sisson. In brief, it is just this: That the Army officers can not create a deficiency and can not keep in the Army more men than the amount of money carried in the bill will pay for.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is that included in this bill?

Mr. Sisson. Yes, sir; it is in this bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. If the gentleman desires to hold the Army down to a certain number of men, might I ask him if there is a provision in this bill which makes it mandatory upon the War Department to discharge a soldier upon his application, without anything else?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. That amendment was agreed upon in conference in so far as it affects men under age and is satisfactory to all the Members of the House on both sides who are desirous that it should go in the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that there have been a number of men in the Army at times that have had applications pending—and I think they frequent the gentleman's office as much as they do mine—for discharges.

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. If a man wants to go out of the Army, and you want to hold the Army at a fixed number, well and good; but if you want to take so many out of the Army and a soldier wants his discharge, why not say it is mandatory upon his superior officer to grant the discharge and let him get out of the Army, without having to resort to a whole lot of red tape to do so?

Mr. Sisson. We have tried to avoid as much as possible any legislation on this bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. You can put it on now if nobody makes a point of order on it.

Mr. Sisson. But the instant we put legislation on the bill we get abused for doing it. What we have been trying to do is to control the situation by limitation of appropriations. We have done the best we could under the circumstances, except I do not think we have gone as low as we might have gone.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman point out where it is made mandatory in this bill for the Secretary of War to discharge from the service, either upon application or without application, anyone except boys under 18 years of age?

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman is right about that.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman said it was mandatory.

Mr. Sisson. If I did, I was in error, because I had my mind directed entirely to that provision that was intended to care for the boys who enlisted under age. That is mandatory. Now, I think it is within the discretion of the Secretary of War to discharge a man who makes his application, and we have endeavored to assist him in making up his mind on the side of the discharge, by putting in the Borah amendment, which says to him, "If you keep more men than the money will pay, you have violated the law."

Mr. BRIGGS. You have also a provision in here that the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men without regard to the existing law relative to discharges. Under existing law it is not mandatory?

Mr. Sisson. It is not mandatory. We might be, in other words, without an Army.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. My question did not go that far, but to the discharges until the number of men reached the number the gentleman wishes to reach.

Mr. Sisson. I think the provisions are sufficiently strong to compel that to be done just as successfully as if it embodied the idea of the gentleman from Texas.

Now, gentlemen, if there are no other questions, I want to say that, taking this bill as a whole, I feel that it is a good one, and that the chairman of the committee and his colleagues are to be congratulated in bringing it here. Of course, it does not suit the wishes of the militarists of the country; it does not suit the majority of the Army officers, or of the General Staff, but it will meet, in my judgment, the approval of the country, certainly to a very much greater extent than if you had burdened them further with a larger Army. It does not suit me because it is too big and costs too much, but it is better than that demanded by the War Department by far. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed five additional minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to have more time than 20 minutes, because I am not going to discuss little points about a few thousand men more or less in the Regular Army, nor shall I discuss the seeming slurs cast upon the conduct of patriotic gentlemen, officers in that Army, or the contempt that has been attached to their view that more men are needed. We may discuss this bill in a much broader way than would be suggested by anything that appears in its terms.

It is the duty of Congress under the Constitution to provide for the common defense, and for land defense the power of Congress is to raise and support armies as well as to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia—that is or should be the Nation. The militia in those days meant every able-bodied man between the ages of 18 and 45. Under that duty, this is the only bill that will come before this House to provide for the common defense, so far as the land is concerned.

Now, I need only point out to the House what is within your own knowledge of the last few years as to what the common defense means. It meant that we had to raise 4,000,000 of men. It meant that war came upon us out of a clear sky, when everybody would have sworn that the peace of the world was more secure than ever it was before. Would that we could say that now. It meant that we had discovered, just as Washington's Congress had provided, that Congress should arm the whole Nation. The other nations were armed, and the war was a war of nations, and not of little standing armies. The 250,000, "the contemptible little army" that England sent into Flanders, was wiped out, horse, foot, and dragoons, officers and men, and conscription sent the manhood of Britain, Canada,

New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa into the field to fight as men had never done before. Then we were drawn in and had to raise our men and send them forth.

What we needed was not a large standing army. The United States can not drill the whole Nation in time of peace. Even Germany only drilled about half of its men during the first three years of manhood. France had a few more, because she was wanting in population; and we were one of the countries which did nothing of the sort, but when we were called into war we needed two things—brains and tools, officers and arms.

In the year 1915 I had seen that England was in the same position. It was a year after the war had been declared, and in 1915 England had over 2,000,000 men drilling in her camps in England, without a rifle there, except on the rifle range, and no rifles seen except on men going to the front.

We were in the same position. We were able, so far as arms were concerned, to get our men to France in numbers in the spring of 1918, a year after the war was declared. For the first few months after war was declared in 1917 our men had no uniforms in camp. They got rifles slowly and with difficulty, as they were manufactured, but when we got over there in 1918 we had no artillery, and we never used anything but French artillery and French shells through the whole summer of 1918 and down to the armistice. And we had, as we all know, no aviation.

Worse than that, we started without officers, and I remember going down to the officers' training camp at Fort Myer and seeing how much the young men were prized who had had any military drill in a little cavalry troop at home, because most of the men knew nothing. But we took those men and the students in the colleges and made officers of them, and the response of American skill and energy was such that in a year we had an army really organized.

I want to say only one thing. Shall we get into that situation again? We did not then go to war with Germany or some other country landing on our shores. We then had time to get arms and equipment, and to educate officers who could train men to obey, and with time to organize alongside of armies already abroad. We shall not have that time in any future war. We must be ready with trained officers and equipment for armies now, and a certain amount of drill on the part of the men.

A word more about the Constitution. It is held to be an out-of-date instrument, as some people think, but it recognized the fact that we were to organize, arm, and discipline the Nation. The new fact that has been brought home to us in the Great War is that the whole Nation must be ready to take the field. Standing armies came to be relied on in the nineteenth century. Standing armies are now as out of date as when our forefathers went into the wilderness to fight Indians, each man with his own musket. Do not say that I am in favor of the European system of universal military training, for I am not. I do not believe in taking men away from their homes for years and putting them in camps. I do not believe that American sentiment will stand for it, but I do believe that American sentiment will stand for having enough arms to put into our boys' hands when our country calls them to arms. I believe that American sentiment will say that it is an outrage that there should not be adequate stores of rifles and cannon, so that if you call men to arms you can put arms into their hands. I believe that American sentiment will deem it is an outrage that there should not be in storage a reserve supply of uniforms and tent equipment. The storage costs little.

I want to call the attention of this Congress to the singular disposition that exists to sell our military equipment at any sacrifice. Among the last circulars is one about brass cartridge cases, saying that the War Department have sold the whole remaining stock of 14,000,000 pounds of brass cartridge cases. I suppose that means for small arms and light artillery.

These cartridges would not spoil by keeping. We are not told what they cost or what they were sold for. The report of the total sales is enough to make a man ask questions. On April 18, 1921, the War Department authorized publication of the statement that the sales of surplus property consummated by the several selling branches of the War Department up to and including March 31, 1921, expressed in cost price to the Government, amounted to \$1,445,675,027.02—a billion and a half on the cost of stores. What did they get for them? The selling price is not stated. They say they are surplus. If we are going to train our schools, if we are going to demand of every man between the ages of 18 and 21 that he do his tour of service in the militia, in the National Guard, or whatever it may be, so as to get some training; if we are going to have a reserve, remember that there will be 3,000,000 men each year who will be given some sort of training and who will need arms.

We ought to know what the War Department considers a surplus. In 1917, when we were urging that there should be more cannon, and the Chief of Ordnance reported to us that he thought he was having enough cannon, because in the course of seven years he would have enough to arm a first line of 500,000 men, I asked him to his face what he meant by a first line and where were the cannon for the second line to come from. He said they would wait until we needed them.

One difference between the War Department and the Congress is that the War Department has one essential fault, that the officers being paid and depending for their rank upon the number of soldiers, they sometimes care more about the number of soldiers in the Regular Army—and they are more likely to provide for a good-sized Regular Army—than to look at the question whether there are arms, ammunition, and officers ready to equip and take care of the Nation in time of war.

This bill involves bigger questions than whether this Regular Army shall be of 150,000 or 175,000 men. We ought to know whether the arms, equipment, and camping places, with drainage and access by railroad, which were ready for use in case of difficulty, have been scrapped. When I was last in Congress my last speech was headed, "Do not scrap preparedness." I appeal to the Congress to consider this bill in more important matters than the mere question of the number of men in the Regular Army. Is the United States ready to call our people to arms? Preparedness is not a costly thing. Readiness in equipment and reserve officers cost less than keeping men under arms. I think we are wasting money in paying men for joining the militia and serving in the National Guard at \$2 a day, or something of the sort. If there is any duty that a man ought to perform before he comes to vote, whether he comes from abroad or whether he was born here, it is to serve his three years in the home guard, the militia, or National Guard, or whatever it may be. It costs nothing to give that service once a week. It ought to cost nothing. If there is any one thing that school-boys would enjoy it is having arms furnished and officers detailed to take care of their school training, and it costs nothing except the arms, of which I believe we have plenty now. If there is anything that would give us officers, it would be to introduce the same training into the colleges. The Constitution lets the States train the militia. I am not sure whether schools are better run from a central authority than run by the locality. We have not always seen good results in running schools from Washington, whether among the Indians or in the Territories of the United States. Centralized government does not always create enthusiasm. No such energy was ever shown by a disciplined force as is shown by football teams in the colleges under the spur of emulation. It may not be impossible to offer prizes and have competitive inspections between the militia of the different States, so as to find out which are the best and to get at the earnestness of America in favor of learning without pay; but to do this we must have the arms and we must have the officers.

The military training of officers is not so very difficult. The question has been met in various colleges. They could send their graduates to West Point to stand the same examination with the West Point cadets; not to become officers of the Regular Army, but to receive a reserve officer's certificate after competitive examination. If that be done we shall find out what the colleges of this country can do in that regard. If we want to enlarge West Point, it does not need buildings. When I first knew West Point it had few buildings compared to what it has now. It had a beautiful site, and then cost as little for each cadet as a regiment costs per man, or nearly so. It is not impossible to take a brigade of 4,000 men and start a new West Point in the camps without putting up a building. It is not impossible to take a division of 25,000 men and do the same thing, enlisting boys at 18 for four years with the understanding that only the best should stay in the Army after those four years spent in that regiment, and that the rest must go into civil life. Officers of that sort in civil life with a military training—think what that would do for your militia. People say that they do not get good officers in the militia because the election of the officers is left to the militia. They do not get good officers because they can not find them. The militia are ready to take trained men whenever they can get them. The more severe the drill the more they like the officers who give it to them if those officers only show intelligence and teach them their business.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have about finished what I had to say. My time is nearly gone.

In considering this military bill Congress ought to look beyond the mere size of the Army—a question that interests Army officers all too much. Congress wants to know what reserves we have, the officers and arms, brains and tools, and how thor-

oughly the Nation is organized, so that it can turn out and obey the call to arms in case of need. Congress should look beyond the mere details of the bill whether it relates to ordnance or whatever it may be. Congress, if it does its duty, will find out whether we are doing our duty in providing for the common defense of our country, remembering that the storm cloud may break at any moment. In the most peaceful days let us determine that we will keep prepared. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, Col. VAILE.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know where I got the title of "colonel" which my friend from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] so generously confers upon me. I never earned it, I am sorry to say. I did earn the lesser titles of corporal, sergeant, and second lieutenant, though not in the present war. I think the splendid address just given by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] certainly ought to bear some fruit. We have had discussion here for two days on the question of disarmament. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] gets up and announces with pride that he has voted against every appropriation bill for the Army and the Navy since the armistice. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] regrets that while the echo of the oratory, as he calls it, in favor of disarmament is still ringing in our ears we are not disarming fast enough.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield? I voted for the bill.

Mr. VAILE. I know the gentleman did, and I am glad he did so. If my friend who rose to make that interjection had kept his ears open, he would have heard the echo of something else besides oratory; he would have heard the still resounding echo of British guns defending our soldiers on their way across the seas in the battle for humanity; he would have heard the echo of the guns of our allies holding the lines in France and Belgium for 14 months before we got a single soldier on the battle line after we entered the war. And at a moment when we are not yet through, when we have not actually concluded the greatest war in all history, it seems to me it is the wrong time to obliterate all the lessons of history in talk about general disarmament. We ought to go mighty slow on that proposition. Does human nature change in a generation? Let me read a few facts of American history that ought to be remembered. I have here a table in my hand showing that we have had one year of war out of every six years in our whole national history. You can figure it out yourselves. I will ask unanimous consent to put this in the Record.

The table referred to is as follows:

Wars of the United States.

	Years.	Days.
Revolution: From the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776, to the withdrawal of the British troops from New York, Nov. 25, 1783.	7	144
War of 1812: From the declaration of war by United States, June 18, 1812, to the Battle of New Orleans, Jan. 5, 1815.	2	204
War with the Barbary pirates: Declared by Algiers in 1812. Excluding time concurrent with War of 1812, and calculating from conclusion of that war, Jan. 5, 1815, to final treaty with the Dey of Algiers, concluded on flagship of American Navy, July 6, 1818.	3	182
Mexican War: From the declaration of war by United States, Apr. 24, 1846, to signing of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Feb. 2, 1848.	1	284
Civil War: From attack on Fort Sumter, Apr. 12, 1861, to surrender by Gen. Kirby Smith of last Confederate force in the field, May 26, 1865.	4	44
Spanish War: From date declared by Congress as date of commencement of state of war, Apr. 21, 1898, to signing of treaty of Paris, Dec. 10, 1898.		211
Philippine insurrection: Feb. 1, 1899, to restoration of civil government, July 4, 1901.	2	153
World War: From declaration of war by United States, Apr. 6, 1917, to armistice, Nov. 11, 1918.	1	219
Total duration of American wars.	23	346
Total duration of the United States to this date, Apr. 28, 1921.	144	298
Percentage of United States history in which United States has been actually engaged in war, 16.5.		

Note on the foregoing table: Where "signing" of the treaty of peace is given as the date of the conclusion of a war, that date has been considerably in advance of the official termination effectuated by the ratification of the treaty. In the case of the war with the Barbary States, a peace treaty was signed June 30, 1815, but Algiers immediately resumed hostilities. The date of the final treaty is therefore used. It will be observed that in the foregoing table no calculation has been made of time spent in the Revolutionary War prior to the Declaration of Independence, Indian wars, the Boxer expedi-

tion, or the World War after the armistice, although that war is not yet officially concluded and American troops have been occupying foreign soil for more than two years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the world is undoubtedly sick of war. It is our duty to use every possible means consistent with our obligations to our country to prevent war. But I respectfully submit that humanity has not yet worked out a way to prevent it. Certainly our own history of one year of war to every five years of peace is not a very good guaranty that we are through with wars, and we are not a quarrelsome Nation, either. And the wars referred to in my table are not all old wars by any means. Does human nature change in a single generation? One man who sits before me at this moment—our dear friend "Uncle" JOE CANNON, of Illinois—can himself remember five of the eight wars of the United States, if we count the Philippine insurrection as a war. Men were killed in it for nearly two years and a half. There are a number of men in this House who can remember four of these wars. Men of my age—and I am not old enough to be a colonel—have fought in three of them.

Has human nature so changed that we shall not guard the heritage left by our fathers by being prepared for war? Are we going to throw preparedness on the scrap heap? You men are the representatives of the American people. Have not you a trust of the American people to protect the institutions handed down by our ancestors? How were they handed down? Did George Washington win the liberty of this country by negotiation and argument? He did not; he won it by the sword. Did Abraham Lincoln keep the country united by argument? That wise man, great conciliator as he was, was not able to accomplish that feat. He kept this country together because he was the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States and used their force.

I hope disarmament may come, but it will not prevent war. It must come after war has been prevented by other means. No nation ever yet prevented attack by being unprepared to meet it. Will reasonable armament of our country induce it to attack other nations? I have too much confidence in the American people to believe anything of the sort. Will reasonable armament of our country induce other nations to attack us? To ask that question is to answer it in the negative.

Oh, my friends, as American legislators, guardians of a sacred trust which has had to be defended righteously with the sword before this day, let us not hurry disarmament before we are fairly out of the last war we have been in—a war that nearly wrecked the whole of the world. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWLING].

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate that has been had for the last few days on the question of Army and Navy appropriations. It has been very interesting and informative to me, not knowing about the question heretofore except what I have read in the newspapers and what I have heard talked at crossroads where most of the national questions are finally settled, as we all know.

One of the remarkable things in connection with the whole debate to me is this: It seems that a reduction of armament, of universal disarmament, is universally desirable and that it is unanimously supported in the House of Representatives. But at the same time we can not get it. That seems to be a thing that is illogical; that which we all want we can not get. It was announced by the majority leader this morning that the feeling is unanimous in the House of Representatives to do this very thing. But for some reason we can not have this universally desirable thing. What is the matter? I do not know, but I apprehend that down at the bottom a great deal of it is due to our natural love for the fighting men. We all instinctively love a fighter, whether he is an individual fighter or a national fighter. I think sometimes that is a part of our inheritance from the days of the cave man when the individual went out with a club to get his dinner, or whatever else he wanted, when the only law was the law of the club, and it has come to us all the way down from the days when the fighting sentiment was a part of the possession of our ancestors. So we love to hear the clank of arms and see the march of armies. The pomp and circumstance of glorious war appeal to all of us and we do not love to turn our Army loose. The gentleman who preceded me had something to say about the great armies in the late war.

Twenty-six billion dollars was the cost of that experiment. We gained much by that, beyond doubt—some that we do not comprehend now, much that we will see in the future—of good.

But where did we get the \$26,000,000,000 to spend if not through years of peace and peaceful activities which preceded our war-like period of 1917 and 1918?

Wars have existed largely in the world's history heretofore because diplomacy was silent, because for a long time in the history of men the only way that men knew how to get anything they wanted was to fight for it. In time of war the laws are silent, we hear. Men did not negotiate or they did not know how to negotiate, but they proposed to decide everything that came up by the law of force.

I want to call the attention of the committee to one thing, that while it is a great thing to be a great military nation it is a greater thing to be a peaceful nation. We would not have had to cross the seas if it had not been for the militaristic spirit that had existed there for years and years. A parallel has been drawn here to-day between what was suggested as our state of unpreparedness and the military conditions in Europe. Let us not forget that while that is true this peace-loving Nation is yet a solvent nation, carrying on her industries, while the militaristic nations of Europe are flat on their backs and are asking for help from America. [Applause.] After all it is the peace-loving nation and not the militaristic nation that is to-day blessing the world. At this time, whether we disarm or not, whether it is possible for us to disarm or not, I would have us at least think for a little while about the declaration of the great old John Milton, that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war." That was true 250 years ago when he said it, and it is true now; but the nations have never lived up to it.

Have you ever stopped to think that all of our choicest honors and our most desirable rewards have been reserved by the peoples of all nations for their military heroes? The United States is dotted from Maine to California with monuments to men, most of whom were soldiers. They pierce every sky. Every State, nearly every community, has remembered some fighting man. It is no trouble to find a monument to Grant and to Lee, to Jackson and to Sherman; but where do you find a monument to the inventor of the sewing machine; where do you find a monument to the inventor of the reaper? Those men have been forgotten when the honors have been parceled out. If peace hath her victories no less renowned than war, then she should have her honors and rewards for the men who have made this Nation the most glorious of all in art, invention, and discovery; and while we are considering these millions of dollars that are being appropriated here for the Army and the Navy, let us recall the glory of the discoverers and the inventors, the workers of America, and try to do something for them. [Applause.]

Let me read you a figure or two. For two years—that is, last year and the current year—the appropriations for the Army, including those proposed in this bill, amount to \$780,000,000, and for the Navy for the same length of time \$882,000,000—a total of \$1,662,000,000 for the Army and the Navy for two years, an amount that is beyond the comprehension of the human mind, given over finally to destruction. We say that it is necessary to be done in order to protect ourselves. Is it not a reflection upon the human race when we, the most peaceful Nation in the world, have to expend \$1,662,000,000 in one biennial period for the Army and the Navy?

A battleship costs \$37,000,000 we were told the other day, and it is obsolete in 10 years. It goes to the scrap heap or is blown up by a bomb from a fighting airplane. Thirty-seven million dollars would endow a university equal in rank and opportunity to Princeton, for instance, and instead of being obsolete in 10 years, that university would live to bless the world for a thousand years. Which would you rather have? And yet they say we must have these things, and I reckon that we must, and I suppose we will all vote for this bill, just as we did for the naval bill, which passed just a few minutes ago without a roll call. How are we going to get this thing, which everyone says we want, and that we all say we ought to have?

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWLING. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman remember the case of the great university in Belgium which was destroyed by war? How are we going to protect these universities the gentleman is talking about unless we are prepared to defend them?

Mr. BOWLING. I remember all about that, but the mere fact that it was destroyed furnishes no reason in the world why they should not be built, and the basic reason for building them is greater and better and more appealing to humanity than the militaristic spirit that would put the money in war. Belgium was like a child at home whose peace and safety had been guaranteed by its own father and mother. Those who

guaranteed that peace turned their back upon her and destroyed this flower of Belgian civilization.

Mr. VAILE. Who is to guarantee our peace and safety, if not ourselves?

Mr. BOWLING. We guarantee it ourselves, and we always have guaranteed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi to yield me one minute more.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more.

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Chairman, these things that we have built up here must be protected. I do not want us to strip ourselves of our Army and walk away, but I want us to think on these noble and glorious things rather than to put into effect, as was suggested a moment ago, a system of universal training, which will teach boys of this land a love for war and tend to make of us a military nation.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a short table of figures, which I referred to a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, in my opinion if we had a constructive policy in regard to our Army we could prepare this country for all eventualities much better with \$200,000,000 than we are doing under this bill. I do not say that with any reflection upon the committee. I understand the handicap that it is facing. The trouble with our Army program in this country is that we do not go at it with any degree of knowledge of the facts. If I am right, if you are going to have a definite military policy in this country, you will have to ignore the General Staff largely in defining what you are to do.

Let me call your attention to this: An efficient Army is composed of three branches, which I will name in the order of their importance. First, trained officers in abundance; second, a supply system; third, enlisted men. The first two can not be obtained in less than five years. The third you can get plenty of, the very best fighters, in six months to a year; and yet the General Staff and all Army men pay all their attention to the third and very little to the first two. Now, with \$20,000,000 you can have from 100,000 to 200,000 trained officers in your reserves. There is no question about it. With your Reserve Officers' Training Corps functioning, with \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 to stimulate enlistments, you can have from 100,000 to 200,000 trained officers in this country all the time, and that is the first great step in preparedness. The next step is a supply system that will function; and I want to call the attention of your committee to the fact that the General Staff of the American Army, to its everlasting disgrace, never studied a supply system before this war. The only system that it studied was how not to have supplies, so that when the war came it would have an opportunity to go out and purchase the supplies of the corporations of this country.

Consequently when we went into this war we did not have a blue print of a modern piece of artillery in the Ordnance Department of the American Army. We had to send to France to get a blue print of a piece of artillery, and we paid billions of dollars out and never shot one piece of American artillery over our boys in France with the exception of five naval pieces on railroad cars near Metz that were made in a navy yard. Now, my contention is this, and if I am wrong I want some one to show me where I am wrong. If you want a supply system you ought to expend your money in your Government-owned factories and your navy yards. Then you will have something. Every dollar that you spend outside in privately owned corporations is money wasted. They produce something to-day and to-morrow they produce something else, and all your jigs, tools, and so forth, are lost and you have nothing, whereas if you spend the money in your Government-owned factories you are not encouraging war industry, but you are preparing your country for war.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has been on the Committee on Military Affairs for a number of years and has given this subject a good deal of study. What is the gentleman's idea about the size of the standing Army of enlisted men at this time?

Mr. HULL. Well, that has many angles. I contend that right now if you had trained officers you could reduce your Army to 100,000 or 150,000 safely, because all that the enlisted personnel of the American Army amounts to in an offensive or a defensive war outside of the country is negative. A foreign war would demand an Army of three or four million men. You can not keep up this enlisted strength. All you want in the enlisted personnel is simply to preserve order in this country and for our outside possessions. I believe that gradually we can reduce to 100,000 men safely, but I say that you must keep up the trained officers and you must keep up a supply system, and you must get a General Staff that will do it. We do not have one now.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. ROSE. I would like to have the gentleman say from the knowledge he has from the study of this subject whether at this particular time he would advocate a standing Army of less than 150,000 men under existing conditions?

Mr. HULL. No, I would not, I will say very frankly to the gentleman. If you could reduce your Army to 175,000 right now, I would say you were making splendid progress, and I will tell you why. The reason for that is this, because of the divided way of appropriating in this House you have an Army of 50,000 to 60,000 too large to-day, and the first thing is to get that Army down to 175,000, in my opinion. It is unthinkable to me for this Government to do as the Appropriations Committee has asked them to do in this very bill, discharge a man arbitrarily. This country has not reached the point that it ought to break faith with the man who has enlisted to defend the country. You voted a billion dollars to keep faith when you did not have written contracts with the contractors of this country. Are you going to break faith with the enlisted man? Yet that is what this bill does.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. Can the gentleman tell the Committee of the Whole why we could not get along, what the real reason is—I do not care anything about verbiage, but the specific fact—that we can not get along with a less Army to-day than we could 15 years ago?

Mr. HULL. Well, I have already said I believe we can safely get down to an Army of 100,000; but you can not do it, because this is the trouble: You have 235,000 men in the Army to-day, and from 180,000 to 190,000 of those men are enlisted for three years. You should not discharge them arbitrarily. If you do, it puts our Government in the attitude of breaking their own contract with enlisted men. This, as I understand it, is base ingratitude, and an unthinkable thing for any government to do.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. SWING. Referring to the breaking of faith with the enlisted man, does not the gentleman think that at least 50,000 men in the Army to-day would gladly accept an honorable discharge to-morrow if the opportunity were afforded them to get out honorably?

Mr. HULL. I do not think that that is true. I do believe that what we ought to do in this bill is to limit the authority to pay every man like that and make them discharge him. I would favor that in an amendment. I believe we ought to have an opportunity to put it in the bill, but I am not in favor of the Borah amendment that is in this bill, which practically says to the War Department, "You must discharge the men whether they want to go out or not." That is breaking faith with the enlisted personnel.

Mr. LAYTON. How many men are considered by the committee to be absolutely necessary for our island possessions?

Mr. HULL. I do not think you would find any agreement on that.

Mr. LAYTON. Certainly not.

Mr. HULL. For instance, some say you have got to have a division down at Panama. I do not agree with that theory. I do not think we need it.

Mr. LAYTON. How many in the Philippines?

Mr. HULL. Some want a division or two divisions out there, and another division at Honolulu.

Mr. LAYTON. As a matter of fact, if you have three divisions out there, or even four divisions, and the only nation on earth that wants the Philippines should try to take them, they would not amount to anything?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman is absolutely right. The enlisted personnel of the American Army hardly amounts to anything as far as the outside possessions are concerned.

Mr. LAYTON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly in his statement and the order in which he places the necessity for the Army.

Mr. HULL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAYTON. I compliment him and not myself. My idea is to have a large number of competent officers and, as the gentleman says, supplies; for, after all, we know if you had half a million men on the pay roll of the United States it would hardly amount to anything in the face of a big war, because then you would have to have millions of men.

Mr. HULL. It amounts to nothing, practically. What you have got to do, I say, is to prepare the country with trained officers and with supplies, and there is our trouble to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I would like to know if the gentleman from Iowa or any other member of the Military Committee can give me the information as to why the War Department has 7,000,000 rounds of ammunition on hand of all calibers?

Mr. HULL. I would have to take many times 20 minutes if I would try to explain to you many things the War Department does. I can not do it. Nobody can. I have been on the committee a little over six years, and I am amazed at the way the high command of the American Army will smoke-screen Congress, camouflage themselves, and fool all the people. [Applause and laughter.] They are the hardest combination to handle that I ever had anything to do with.

Now, I do not want you to think that I am unfriendly to the Army, for I am not. We have got to have an Army, and we should have a good Army and an efficient one, and that is what I am advocating. But I am trying to perfect a supply system. I believe that is almost as important as trained officers. And I believe that with some 20 great Government-owned factories in this country manufacturing munitions of war, we ought to manufacture practically everything that we need in those factories. That is the best thought of the world and of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will that not be impossible under this administration, for the reason that your distinguished President said that the Government must go out of business and that the business men must run this thing?

Mr. HULL. I will say to my Democratic friend from Mississippi that I do not believe he interprets the President correctly on the question of munitions of war. And I will say further that I, as a Republican, if they mean to do that, will not defend the Republican administration, like your party defended the Democratic administration when it went wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I would like to say to the gentleman, because I am a great admirer of him, that I have voted with him, as he will see if he will examine the RECORD. And I want to indorse his speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains to this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-three minutes, and 54 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the things for which we provide in the Army and Navy appropriation bills are but outward evidences of our real national strength and defense. In the days of old the Israelites sought to obey the scriptural injunction that they should not put their faith in horses and in chariots, which in those times were implements of war. A proper preparation in the materials of warfare is a very important matter, and the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] along that line were specially forceful, but we should not be deceived by these appropriation measures as to what constitutes our real national strength and in what, fundamentally and primarily, our faith should be placed.

You recall the beautiful poem of Robert Burns, "The Cotter's Saturday Night," in which he pictures at eventide, after the work of the week is over, the tired, toilworn cotter at his fireside blessed with all the humble joys and commonplace virtues that naturally grace such a family meeting, and in which he says: "From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs."

In that same spirit, gentlemen, the American home has always been the basis of American welfare and prosperity. [Applause.] It is there that the formation of character begins. It is there that the first lessons in citizenship are taught. It is there that the Nation's defense is planned. What truths have been more abiding in our lives than those our mothers taught us in the days of our childhood? The stability of the American home must be maintained in order that from it may continue to come the real strength of American arms—a strength of head and heart which gives purpose and power to the strength of might.

We have to-day made provision—and, under the existing conditions, perhaps necessarily so—for rather an extensive naval program. Our position at sea is somewhat different from that on land. As long as we maintain our present attitude of isolation, as long as we remain outside the pale of the countries that seek to get together and deliberate about disarmament, as long as we permit international jealousy and distrust to determine absolutely the course of nations, as long, in fact, as we remain at sea as to what our program is to be in our intercourse with the peoples of the world, so long, I think, at sea we should have sufficient equipment to defend ourselves.

Our situation with reference to the Army is quite different. It seems that we now have an Army of about 225,000 men. A recently reported statement from the Secretary of War sets forth that he desires an Army of 183,000 men. This bill, we are told, provides for an Army of 168,000. I think the committee is to be commended that it has not yielded to overtures for an increase of that number, but I wish we might go still further and adopt what was evidently the desire of the Sixty-sixth Congress when, in voting upon this matter, it declared its purpose that our Army should not exceed the maximum of 150,000 men.

We do not need and we do not wish in this country a gigantic Military Establishment. I, for one, do not believe that we could follow the same road which Germany traveled without reaching the same destination. In this land of ours a love for civil liberty will always prompt a proper and patriotic demonstration of our military prowess whenever the occasion requires. That prowess springs from the strength of the American home, where the heads and hearts of liberty-loving men are taught to guide their arms.

We have in this country to-day millions of trained young men who are ready to bear the brunt of the battle if strife and tumult should come. We have no fear of any immediate danger in that regard. We know that in times of stress and necessity our Army will be fully and efficiently manned. The reduction in our armed forces which this great reserve renders possible makes for substantial economy, for which there is properly a great popular cry in these trying times, and brings also the opportunity for the conservation of our national strength by permitting men in times of peace to follow the pursuits of peace and seek employment in the fields of production profitably, both for themselves and for the country they serve.

The history of the Americas, gentlemen, refutes any contention that we should have large military establishments in this country. Do you not remember that at Lexington and Concord, "where first the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard around the world," they were vastly outnumbered? But they were not outfought. Do you not remember that in South America the struggling band of patriots who followed the liberator, Simon Bolivar, the man of the south and father of five countries, were but few in comparison with those who battled against them? And yet they were not outfought. In my own native State, in the early days of its most glorious history, the men who at the Alamo and Goliad and San Jacinto struggled so valiantly for Texas' independence were overwhelmingly outnumbered, but they were not outfought. Victory has eventually come to each and every Army which we have had in the Western Hemisphere battling for freedom and the priceless principles of liberty. [Applause.] And a similar victory will come whenever such conflict is thrust upon us as long as the similar graces and similar virtues which our old-fashioned fathers and mothers used to teach us live and thrive in American homes. [Applause.]

While the American home retains its sanctity and its honor and its hallowed teachings, while American parents instruct their children in the lessons which American patriots should learn, while the Nation that we love cherishes the principles which so lately led our boys to battle and to victory, the real Army of this country will be numbered by its millions who work in times of peace and fight in times of war. The real strength of the Nation is in this reserve. Let us not deceive ourselves

into believing that, on the contrary, it is manifested by the size of the uniformed force for which we now provide. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, a matter of particular interest in this bill that we are considering now is that of pay of the Army affecting as it does the size of the Army. It is the item in which there is the greatest difference between the bill that is now reported and the bill that formerly passed the House. In connection with that subject we should give particular attention to the provisions in the bill affecting the size of the Army other than the item of pay of the Army.

I would direct your attention to the paragraph immediately following the item for pay of the Army at the bottom of page 15 and the first part of page 16, with reference to discharges. Lines 23 to 25 of page 15 and lines 1 to 10 of page 16 have reference to the discharge of boys under 18 years of age, and it is not expected that that will affect a great number. But lines 10, 11, 12 and 13 on page 16 read as follows:

The Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is concerned about the possibility of breaking contracts under that provision. I do not want to take time to contest with him about it, except to make this one statement, that when any man enlists his enlistment contract provides that it may be terminated at any time at the will of the Government.

But in any event in lines 10 to 13 we give the Secretary of War ample authority to reduce the size of the Army by allowing the discharge on application of the soldier, and if there is not a sufficient number of those to meet the occasion to discharge arbitrarily without application.

The other provision of great importance is at the top of page 22, lines 1 to 5, the proviso known as the Borah amendment, because it was first introduced in the other body in connection with the former bill by the Senator from Idaho. That proviso is:

Provided further, That the Army shall be reduced by the Secretary of War so that the sum herein appropriated shall defray the entire cost of the pay of the officers and enlisted men of the line and staff during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

We make it clear there that there is to be no deficiency appropriation with respect to the pay of the Army. The amount we put in the bill is to pay the Army for the next year. It is true we do not provide a penalty here if the Secretary fails to follow it. We do not provide for hanging or anything of that kind, but we feel confident and we know that the Secretary will respect the decision of Congress, will accept that direction, and that whatever amount is appropriated for pay of the Army will pay the Army, and that he will make the reductions necessary to bring it within that amount.

The former bill, as I stated in the House on the 3d of March in connection with the conference report upon it, carrying approximately \$78,000,000 for pay of the Army, would have provided for an average force of 156,653 men for the fiscal year 1922. In order to secure that amount, there being on the 3d of March about 239,000 men in the Army, the War Department could have come within that figure of an average of 156,000 men by a wastage estimated then at 6,000 to 7,000 men a month because of the expiration of enlistments, and an additional discharge, either on application or arbitrarily, of 7,000 or 8,000 men a month. The discharge of 7,000 or 8,000 men a month prior to the expiration of their enlistments would have brought the Army then between the 3d of March and the 1st of July down to 180,000 men, and then continuing the reduction proportionately between the 1st of July and the 1st of January following it would have been down to 150,000 on the 1st of January next, and that continued to the end of the year would have given an average of 156,000 plus. That was not drastic. It could have been done. But the bill failed to become a law. The Secretary of War still contends that under existing law he can not discharge before the expiration of enlistments, and so we have come now to the end of April with a bill before us that is not likely to become law before the 1st of June, if not even later than that, with an Army of 230,000 men. It is expected that on the 30th of April we will have 227,831 men, and that on the 30th of June, with the natural wastage because of expirations, there will still be in the Army not 180,000 men but

215,385. That includes the Philippine Scouts, approximately 7,000, which would leave the Army exclusive of the Philippine Scouts about 208,000 men.

To reduce the Army to the figure we give in this bill—which contemplates an average not of 156,000 plus, as in the former bill, but of 168,000—to reduce between the 1st of June, when this bill is likely to become a law, and the 1st of July, in the period of one month, instead of having arbitrary discharges amounting to only 7,000 or 8,000 men a month, as we contemplated in the former bill, the Secretary of War will have to discharge in that one month 40,000 men in order to keep his Army up to the figure of 168,000 during the year. Of course, in connection with the Borah amendment, it becomes apparent that the sooner the War Department comes to the average figure of 168,000 the nearer the Army will remain at that figure at the end of the year. If on the 1st of July they have not made a reduction below 215,000, or, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, 208,000, at the end of the year they will be far below 168,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield for a brief question. I want to complete this idea.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman please state whether any previous bills have carried a provision similar to the Borah amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; and because of that fact—that previous bills have not contained any such provision—the War Department this year, under Secretary Baker, in the face of the feeling of the country and the views of Congress, continued recruiting thousands of men every month when Congress wanted a reduction. That is the cause of our trouble, the fact that nothing like that appeared in the previous bills and the War Department would come in and get a deficiency appropriation for the pay of the Army.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CROWTHER). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield to myself five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes additional.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, if the War Department prefers not to discharge anyone arbitrarily, they can get an average of 168,000 for the year without discharging a single man arbitrarily. If my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], were Secretary of War, entertaining the views that he does, in which I share very generally, he could simply permit the natural wastage to come, and if I have permission I am going to put the figures in the RECORD showing by that natural wastage, without taking any new enlistment, without discharging a single man before his time expires, they could, by the 30th of June, 1922, the end of the next fiscal year, reduce the Army to 126,516 men, with an average for the year of 174,180. From this you subtract 7,000 men of the Philippine Scouts and you have an average of about 167,000 to 168,000 men, just what the bill provides. So that under this bill we give them enough money to carry an army for the year without discharging any man arbitrarily.

But the War Department is very anxious that the Army shall never get down to 126,000, and hence they will discharge the men in the early part of the year and keep the average up. That responsibility will be with the War Department. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put these figures in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a further observation. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] that this bill does not represent the views of the House as to the ultimate size of the Army. I believe that for our present need a police force of 125,000 men is ample for the country as a standing army. But I agree with others that we should, as a matter of preparedness against war, provide amply for the training of officers and for scientific investigations, as in the field of ordnance, the field of aviation, and realm of chemical warfare. But as a police force a regular standing army of 125,000 is sufficient.

But as a member of the committee I feel a responsibility that in reducing the size of the Army we ought not to absolutely ruin it even as a police force. Under the bill we offer you, if they take the action we expect they will and cut the Army to 168,000 the 1st of July, one man out of every five in the Army has got to be taken out in a month, and that is about speed

enough. We think we have kept in view the wishes of the House, kept in view our own wishes, and still tried to do that which is practicable and reasonable.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman think he is justified in providing for the discharge of these men arbitrarily?

Mr. CRAMTON. I believe that we are justified in discharging the enlisted men under the terms of their contracts.

Mr. HULL. But you are breaking faith with the men.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not say that we are justified in discharging them under the terms of the contract, to say nothing of many men in the Army that want to get out.

Mr. HULL. You break faith with them on an implied contract?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; we do not do anything of the kind. The Secretary of War can comply with the provision we are making and not discharge a man before his term expires, whether it would be a breach or not.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWING. Is it not possible for Congress to control the War Department instead of the War Department controlling Congress with reference to the method of reducing the Army, so that the method which you advocate and with which I agree shall be carried out?

Mr. CRAMTON. That would properly come from the Committee on Military Affairs, of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is a member. The Committee on Appropriations can only appropriate the money.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will.

Mr. KETCHAM. Referring to the matter of contract, is it not a fact that other Government contracts are made of a similar character, leaving the cancellation at the discretion and desire of the Government—as contracts for post-office buildings, and so forth?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is very often done. Under my leave to extend I submit the following from the Chief of Finance of the Army, Gen. Lord:

Statement showing estimated average enlisted strength of the Army during the fiscal year 1921, based upon losses by expiration of term of service and other normal causes and no original enlistments.

Date.	Strength.	Enlistments, apprehensions, and surrenders.	Separations.	Net gain.	Net loss.	Months.	Minus.	Plus.
1920.								
June 30.....	184,904					12.0		2,218,848
July 31.....	182,009	15,481	17,776		2,295	11.5	26,393	
Aug. 31.....	186,789	17,446	13,265	4,180		10.5		43,890
Sept. 30.....	189,471	14,672	11,990	2,682		9.5		25,479
Oct. 31.....	193,467	16,668	12,672	3,996		8.5		33,965
Nov. 30.....	204,952	21,312	9,827	11,485		7.5		86,138
Dec. 31.....	219,990	25,400	10,362	15,038		6.5		97,747
1921.								
Jan. 31.....	239,847	26,259	6,402	19,857		5.5		109,214
Feb. 7.....	242,477	3,600	970	2,630		4.9		12,887
Feb. 28.....	239,495	204	3,186		2,982	4.4	13,121	
Mar. 31.....	233,520	781	6,756		5,975	3.5	20,913	
Apr. 30.....	227,831	227	6,016		5,689	2.5	14,223	
May 31.....	221,779	391	6,443		6,052	1.5	9,078	
June 30.....	215,385	446	6,840		6,394	.5	3,197	
Total.....							86,925	2,628,169
								86,925
								12)2,541,244
Average (monthly).....								211,770

Statement showing estimated average enlisted strength of the Army during the fiscal year 1922, based upon losses by expiration of term of service and other normal causes and no original enlistments.

Date.	Strength.	Decrease.	Months.	Minus.	Plus.
1921.					
July 1.....	215,385		12.0		2,584,620
July 31.....	308,100	7,283	11.5	83,755	
Aug. 31.....	200,830	7,270	10.5	76,335	
Sept. 30.....	195,031	5,799	9.5	55,091	
Oct. 31.....	189,240	5,791	8.5	49,224	
Nov. 30.....	182,050	7,190	7.5	53,925	
Dec. 31.....	174,252	7,798	6.5	50,687	
1922.					
Jan. 31.....	166,469	7,783	5.5	42,806	
Feb. 28.....	161,837	4,632	4.5	20,844	
Mar. 31.....	158,227	3,610	3.5	12,635	
Apr. 30.....	147,202	11,025	2.5	27,562	
May 31.....	135,946	11,257	1.5	16,885	
June 30.....	126,516	9,429	.5	4,714	
Total.....				494,463	2,584,620
					494,463
					12)2,090,157
Average (monthly).....					174,180

OFFICE CHIEF OF FINANCE,
Apr. 15, 1921.

The above figures include Philippine Scouts and Flying Cadets.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks on the naval bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the naval bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this discussion has disclosed to me several facts. The first is that practically every Member of this House realizes that the country wants relief from the war burden that it is bearing.

The gentleman from Ohio, Hon. THEODORE BURTON, long a Member of this House and distinguished for his great service as chairman of its Rivers and Harbors Committee, and elsewhere, a seasoned, prudent leader, in his speech on the naval bill, said:

I am making these statements to show how futile it is to attempt any pruning without a radical change of the policies of our country in regard to war and peace. An estimate has been made that by a partial reorganization of the departments 20,000 employees can be discharged. What does that mean? A saving about equal to the cost of a single battleship. Large expenses will continue as an aftermath of war. In the year that ended June 30, 1920, appropriations aggregated nearly \$5,900,000,000, of which barely \$400,000,000 was for the civil expenses of the Government. Thus 93 per cent was associated with war and 7 per cent for peace.

HON. BURKE COCHRAN, of New York, whose prominence, experience, and extended service entitle his words to consideration, in discussing the naval bill, said:

I address myself to that because I believe it goes to the very crux of the gravest problem which the world confronts to-day—and that is the problem of how the world is to disarm. I am one of those who believe that disarmament is not a matter about which the world has any power of election. The question which the nations of the world must decide now is not whether they will maintain huge armaments or abolish them; it is whether they will disarm now while they have something left with which the world can reorganize and reconstruct its industrial life, or delay disarmament until the weapons of war are forced out of their hands by collapse of the whole industrial structure.

Practically every man who has spoken has declared that he favors such relief. I submit that the drift of this discussion shows that the country has no prospect of getting anything of the kind. First, there is no prospect, because no plan has been presented by the administration or any of its spokesmen here. Next, because the attitude of the party administering the Government—the majority party—shows little or no disposition in that direction. Again, the discussion by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who presented the naval appropriation bill and had charge of it here, a man of recognized ability, very properly and ably filling the place which he does, plainly shows that such a plan is not in contemplation by those who framed that measure or other branches of the Government expected to join in its enactment. The gentleman represented his party here, so far as that measure was concerned. He stated that it will be highly improper to invite the Allies or certain nations to a conference while we are building battle-ships and carrying out the program provided for in this bill. You will find that statement on page 639 of the RECORD. I read it:

No more embarrassing situation could be dreamed of than to issue to the nations of the world an invitation to consider the question of disarmament and thereupon immediately proceed to expend the sum of \$90,000,000 in warship construction.

He said also that in order to get into a position to negotiate we ought to complete this program and have a Navy equal to the best in the world. He also stated that this program extends over four years. (Page 566, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 25.) We can not negotiate while this program is being carried out, first, because it would be "embarrassing"; second, because we would not be ready, in that we would not have a Navy equal to the biggest; and that, you must keep in mind, will require four years for its completion, and that, in turn, extends beyond the period for which the present Chief Executive has been elected.

Another reason why the country can get no encouragement from this discussion is the fact that it is argued here that the best way to disarm is to arm heavily. That is the course the world has pursued during all time, and has resulted in all of the woes that we have seen and read of. We are trying a medicine that has been long tried and has always failed. Its failure has filled humanity with woe and the world with ruin.

That is another reason why the country can not get any consolation out of the discussion. Then the gentleman who presented the naval bill said that the program—that is, the agreement to be entered into—according to our contentions or intentions, would be on a percentage reduction, and therefore that we must make our armament so big that after the proportionate reduction is made we would still have a big navy. In other words, we would build so heavily that after we had disarmed we would still be mightily armed. That is like the man in a feud whose friends went to him and asked him to put away his six-shooters. He said, "Let me get six good new ones, and I will put some of my arms away." That is not all. The gentleman said that this disarmament would begin by the abandonment of old ships, by which he meant that we are going to build plenty of good new ships and abandon those that are so old and worthless and expensive that they are of no value anyhow. The feudist agrees to put away some of his guns, but will put away only the old ones that will not shoot anyhow. That is great notice to the nations of the world as to the program outlined and contemplated by the United States as its Government is now being administered; we tell them that we are going to disarm. Yes; we are going to disarm some time, some way, somehow, but first we are going to build the biggest possible navy and armament and are going to build on such proportions that when we make an agreement we will still have supremacy. Next, we are going to make our reduction by abandoning that which is useless. That shows a great conception of international affairs. That is a wonderfully sage, statesmanlike attitude. It shows so much sincerity and wisdom and gives such wonderful promise of success.

Mr. Chairman, the American people usually get what they want. When their Government does not give them that to which they are entitled it is failing, whether my party or yours is responsible. It is a disappointment, it is an injustice to the people of this Nation to see their Government at Washington helpless, impotent, moving along with the tide, moved by folly and characterized by helplessness.

Even the great National Government can not resist the movement, foolish and ruinous as it is. Men representing the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs, while presenting these bills to the House, have said that the committees do not do what their judgment dictates; that there is a smoke screen, a mingling and an intermingling of affairs by those at military

headquarters, a will and power to have its own way in the General Staff, that deprives the Congress of its constitutional power in such matters. Well may the people become uneasy when the men they have sent here to take care of interests which are very dear to the people confess to Congress, in the presence of the country, openly, that they are no longer free, but that a military spirit already has the National Congress more or less intimidated, under control or in some way deprived of its right and power to protect the people in the control of the Army and the appropriations for it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not the gentleman from Texas think that there is a great deal of uncertainty in the minds of Members of Congress as to whether or not the American people are really in favor of disarmament; and if the American people are as sincere and earnest in their desire for disarmament as they were for the Volstead Act does not the gentleman believe that they could bring about disarmament?

Mr. BOX. I will agree that as interpreted by the majority there is a great deal of uncertainty somewhere. I will agree that the majority party shows great uncertainty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I think that can be admitted.

My genial and delightful friend from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] said we should go very slow in disarmament proceedings. He said it twice, "We ought to go slow." Now, you can whisper it all over the country that it is going mighty slow during the next four years, unless your program changes, for here is a building program that must be carried out in order to get us in a position to confer with other nations. And then we expect to make such agreement only as will leave us heavily armed and deprive us only of ships we would throw away anyhow.

Mr. KETCHAM. If the gentleman will yield, when was that program blocked out, and by whom?

Mr. BOX. It was blocked out when the United States was preparing to enter the great conflict to win the war against the man who would have been the tyrant of the world; that is when it was blocked out. Not when we were asking our people to pay honor to the memory of the dead; not when we were looking back sadly and yet proudly to the glorious pages of history written over there; not when our hearts were turned again to peace and industry, but when we were arming for a struggle the result of which was to determine the fate of freedom and the fate of humanity. [Applause.]

It is well for you to follow plans made by wise men, but you should not be so much lacking in judgment and initiative that you stumble blindly on trying to copy in peace times policies made for war times. The supreme folly of this race in the building of armaments and bankrupting the people is sickening and alarming. I quote from a recent news item:

BRITAIN AND JAPAN RENEW NAVAL RACE.

Great Britain has resumed the construction of capital ships and purposes to lay the keels of four this year.

Her naval budget calls for an expenditure of some \$400,000,000. The new ships will be of the type of the *Hood*, one of the most formidable fighting craft afloat.

Japan is engaged in the greatest naval building program ever undertaken by any nation in time of peace and by 1927 will have a fleet almost equal in strength to America's.

Japan's slogan is, "Eight and eight, and no ships more than eight years old." This, according to American information, means that by 1927 her fleet will be virtually the equal of America's, although this country will have superiority in certain directions.

These reports may or may not be true. They or others like them are usually sent back and forth from country to country to act and react in the production of big appropriations, big contracts to gunmakers, armor-plate manufacturers, warship builders, and others who grow fat while the burdens of tax and war equipment are made heavy. If they are true, I do not know whether we are pursuing a suicidally foolish course because England and Japan are, or whether they are doing insane things because we are. It is entirely possible that since the armistice they have watched the course of the party now in charge of our Government closely, and enough and with sufficient discernment to see the situation in America as this debate reveals it. America talking peace and increasing its armament, talking the reduction of armaments via the increase of armaments, expecting only such reduction as will involve the abandonment of ships which would be abandoned anyhow; only such as will not reduce her effective armament at all. Even the abandonment of out-of-date old ships is not to be considered until we have many more newer and better ones, which will require several years and cost several hundreds of millions. War equip-

ments mean war and war means not only taxes many times multiplied; it means economic distress, draft laws, mangled men, soldiers' graves, ruined countries.

If we are making no progress toward arranging for world disarmament why is it? The people want it done. Are we failing because we are not equal to the task? Have we not courage to try? We must not admit that we have been insincere in our many avowals of a purpose to accomplish it. But if we fail it will be either because we will not or because we lack the capacity to meet the great requirement. To have to admit either will convict us before our people and posterity.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Fulmer].

Mr. Fulmer. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the naval appropriation bill.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Anthony. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Tilson, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5010, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Almon, for the day, on account of illness.

To Mr. Lyon, for five days, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. Hukriede, for seven days, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. Anthony. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 29, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

85. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of useless papers from the customs offices in the Buffalo district; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

86. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$47,000 required by the Department of the Interior for mineral-mining investigation under the Bureau of Mines, fiscal year 1922 (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. Webster, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2173) authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a private drawbridge over and across Lock No. 4 of the canal and locks, Willamette Falls, Clackamas County, Oreg., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 27), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. Jones of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2218) granting the consent of Congress to the Washington & Old Dominion Railway, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 28), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. Cooper of Ohio, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3152) granting the consent of Congress to the Ironton & Russell Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near the city of Ironton, Ohio, and between the county of Lawrence, Ohio, and the county of Greenup, Ky., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 29), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. Reavis, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 30)

to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional member of the Joint Committee on Reorganization, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. Hersey, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 82) ratifying the reestablishment of the boundary line between the States of Pennsylvania and Delaware, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 31), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. Kahn, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 63) directing the Secretary of War to furnish the House certain information, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 32), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 67) directing the Secretary of War to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 33), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3116) validating homestead entry of Mike Campbell for certain public land in Alaska; Committee on the Territories discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (H. R. 3390) granting a pension to Henry A. Rowley; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. Fordney: A bill (H. R. 5419) to amend section 4a of the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. Arentz: A bill (H. R. 5420) making appropriation for a hospital building and equipment for the Paiute Indians at Yerington, Nev.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. Drane: A bill (H. R. 5421) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. Johnson of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5422) awarding a gold star to the mothers of all men and women who gave their lives in line of duty in the late war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) regulating the pay of Reserve and National Guard officers when called to active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. Zihlman: A bill (H. R. 5424) increasing the pay of bookbinders and bookbinder machine operators employed in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. Fish: A bill (H. R. 5425) granting the franking privilege to former Presidents and their widows, respectively; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. Hudspeth: A bill (H. R. 5426) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by acts of June 22, 1906, September 24, 1918, and October 22, 1919; and to amend section 14 of the act of Congress approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. Langley: A bill (H. R. 5427) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. Browne of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5428) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Waupaca, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Marshfield, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Clintonville, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Shawano, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to build an extension to the present United States post-office building at Wausau, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at New London, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 5435) to limit rate of interest chargeable to Federal reserve banks to 5 per cent per annum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) giving to the President authority to suspend all or part of the operation of the act of March 4, 1915, known as the La Follette Seamen's Act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 91) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the year 1921; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. COCKRAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) declaring the policy of the United States with respect to disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REAVIS: Resolution (H. Res. 73) for the consideration of Senate joint resolution 30; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress to remedy the conditions existing with respect to the rehabilitation of disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Memorial by the Minnesota State Legislature that the Congress take such measures as may be necessary to provide adequate care and hospitalization for disabled service men, consolidate three agencies now dealing with disabled ex-service men, and to decentralize the administration of the agencies dealing with the disabled ex-service men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 5436) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Millgrove, State of Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5437) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wausau, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wisconsin Rapids, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshfield, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shawano, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Weyauwega, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5442) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wautoma, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5443) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waupaca, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Iola, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wittenberg, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5446) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clintonville, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5447) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New London, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5448) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mosinee, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5449) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Redgranite, State of Wisconsin, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5450) granting a pension to Rose M. Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5451) granting a pension to Nora Hazard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5452) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5453) granting a pension to Carrie C. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5454) granting a pension to Marion D. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 5455) granting an increase of pension to Helen I. Tilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 5456) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Marcus Hook, State of Pennsylvania, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 5457) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Corey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLOUSE: A bill (H. R. 5458) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jamestown, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gainesboro, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carthage, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5461) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Celina, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5462) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Algood, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hartsville, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5464) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wartburg, State of Tennessee, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 5465) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Vicksburg, State of Mississippi, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yazoo City, State of Mississippi, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5467) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Jackson, State of Mississippi, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5468) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brandon, State of Mississippi, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5469) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canton, State of Mississippi, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5470) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Raymond, State of Mississippi, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 5471) granting a pension to Hattie Jeffers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Farmington, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Morris Busch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 5474) for the relief of Benjamin F. Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 5475) for the relief of the Standard American Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5476) for the relief of the North American Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 5477) for the relief of the Lebanon National Bank, of Lebanon, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 5478) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Hamrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Hamrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) granting a pension to Charles W. Willis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 5481) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lexington, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5482) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of St. Mathews, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5483) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bishopville, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5484) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sumter, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5485) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orangeburg, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5486) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Columbia, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 5487) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 5488) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Schriver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5489) granting an increase of pension to William S. Richey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 5490) for the relief of Berwind White Coal Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5491) for the relief of the Brooklyn & Manhattan Ferry Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5492) for the relief of the Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 5493) granting a pension to Jennie Upton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 5494) granting an increase of pension to Mary Crosson At-Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 5495) to remit the duty on a carillon of bells to be imported for the Church of Our Lady of Good Voyage, Gloucester, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 5496) granting a pension to Katherine Timlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Springville, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5498) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Aurora, State of New York, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5499) granting an increase of pension to Edward von Lichtenstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5500) to amend the military record of Robert Zink; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Farmer City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5502) granting a pension to Mary J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 5503) granting a pension to Mary A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 5504) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Posey Buckley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5505) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Ion B. Nall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William H. Meglemry; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Charles Obst; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 5508) granting a pension to Nancy I. Wainscott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 5509) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 5510) granting a pension to Emma P. Coffey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 5511) for the relief of John Cestnik, jr.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 5512) authorizing the President to appoint James G. C. Salyers to the position and rank of first lieutenant of Coast Artillery Corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MOTIONS TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEES.

Under clause 4 of Rule XXVII, motions to discharge committees were filed as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN: Motion to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 263) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended.

Also, motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 264) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

356. By Mr. PORTER: Petition of James P. Dawson and numerous other citizens of New York, favoring recognition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

357. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Finke-Uhen Brewing Co., for revision of tax on cereal beverages, and E. A. Marshall and others for removal of 10 per cent tax on yachts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

358. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Worcester Products Co., of Worcester, Mass., relating to repeal of tax on cereal beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

359. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of board of directors of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the proposed removal of the Naval War College from Newport to Washington; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

360. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petitions of Mason & Hamlin Co.; V. D. Ziminsky, per E. T. Slattery Co.; L. C. Pazolt Co. (Inc.); and Ivers & Pond Piano Co., all of Boston, Mass., relative to taxation matters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

361. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the Acme Brewing Co., Bentleyville, Pa., for the repeal of the 15 per cent tax now levied upon cereal beverages; Committee on Ways and Means.

362. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Michael J. Joyce and 60 other citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., in favor of light wine and beer and opposing Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

363. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of A. Burdwise, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against change of duty on imported goods; also, George Updergraff & Son, of Hagerstown, Md., repeal of 10 per cent tax on furs; also, the Brehm Beverage Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against discriminatory tax on cereal beverages; also, Kronenberg X-Ray & Supply Co., of Baltimore, Md., repeal of 5 per cent tax on photographic films and plates, X-ray plates, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

364. Also, petition of Instructive Visiting Nurse Association and H. F. Hildebrand, all of Baltimore, Md., protesting against Ackerman daylight bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

365. Also, petition of Frank M. Dyer, of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of House bill 172; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

366. Also, petition of Henry B. Gilpin Co., of Baltimore, Md., protesting against House bill 2888; to the Committee on Agriculture.

367. Also, petition of George L. Piquett, of Baltimore, Md., advancing certain recommendations for consideration of reclassification of United States employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

368. By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of C. Meleen, of Jemthland, Me., and 83 other residents of Maine, protesting against Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

369. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Otto Huber Brewery, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on cereal beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

370. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Hamburg (N. Y.) Women's Club, urging the passage of the Rogers-Capper bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

371. Also, petition of the South Dakota Press Association, opposed to the repeal of the postal zone rate law; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

372. By Mr. YOUNG: Telegram in the nature of a petition of the Northwestern Division of the North Dakota Educational Association, at a meeting held at Minot, N. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill, to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

373. Also, resolutions of Garrison Lodge No. 90, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Garrison, and of Mott Lodge No. 96, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Mott, both in the State of North Dakota, favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill, to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

374. Also, petition of Hope Lodge No. 29, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Oakes, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the so-called Smith-Towner bill, to establish a department of education, etc.; to the Committee on Education.

375. By Mr. DALLINGER: Resolution of Foreign Policy Association of Massachusetts calls upon Congress to adopt limit on size of United States Army, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

376. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Dunseith Lodge No. 99, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Dunseith, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

377. By Mr. TAGUE: Resolutions adopted by Foreign Policy Association of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

378. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Foreign Policy Association of Massachusetts, urging Congress to reduce the Army to 150,000 men, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

379. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Scatterday (Inc.), of Pontiac, and Murphysboro Bottling Co., of Murphysboro, both in the State of Illinois, protesting against the 10 per cent tax on bottled soft drinks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

380. Also, petition of H. R. Bron and M. J. Kennedy, both of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the 5 per cent excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

381. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Griesedieck Bros. Brewery Co., requesting a repeal of the internal-revenue tax now levied on cereal beverage manufacturers of the country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

382. By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Petition of 70 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of the bill introduced by Mr. MacGREGOR providing for \$5 tax on every imported canary bird; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

383. By Mr. PAIGE: Papers in support of House bill 5399, granting an increase of pension to William O. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

384. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging the passage of the Hill bill to amend the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

385. By Mr. STEPHENS: Petitions of Cereal Beverage Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, Covington and Newport, Ky.; the Hudepohl Brewing Co.; and the Jung Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 29, 1921.

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 28, 1921.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhues, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4803) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	France	McCumber	Shields
Borah	Gerry	McKellar	Shortridge
Broussard	Glass	McKinley	Simmons
Bursum	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Harrell	Myers	Spencer
Cameron	Harris	Nelson	Stanfield
Capper	Harrison	New	Stanley
Caraway	Heflin	Nicholson	Sterling
Colt	Hitchcock	Norbeck	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Townsend
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Trammell
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Phipps	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Pomerene	Warren
Elkins	King	Ransdell	Watson, Ga.
Brund	Ladd	Reed	Willis
Fernald	Lodge	Robinson	
Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Colorado, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Colorado, ss:

Certificate.

I, Carl S. Milliken, secretary of state of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate concurrent resolution No. 7, which was filed in this office on the 24th day of March, A. D. 1921, at 3.35 o'clock p. m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Colorado at the city of Denver this 24th day of March, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

CARL S. MILLIKEN,

Secretary of State.

By CHAS. M. ARMSTRONG,

Deputy.

Senate concurrent resolution 7.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE TIDEWATER ASSOCIATION.

Whereas it is proposed to make such improvements in the St. Lawrence as to make the Great Lakes accessible to ocean-going commerce; and as this improvement will, in effect, bring the State of Colorado hundreds of miles nearer the world's markets; and

As there are within the State great resources that lie wholly undeveloped while the production of all things is diminished or retarded by distance from markets; and

Because our producers and the consuming public have alike suffered enormous losses in the last year by transportation shortage and failure; and

Because by reason of these conditions and the transportation situation constitutes an emergent need; and

As a number of States have joined in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, having as its object, the early undertaking and completion of this improvement:

Resolved, That the State of Colorado is properly associated in the above-named organization with its neighboring commonwealths in pressing to advance this undertaking, and that the action of the governor in so declaring is hereby approved and confirmed, and the participation of this State by the governor and those who represent him in the council of these States is approved.

Resolved, That the representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States be requested to facilitate and expedite in every possible way the prosecution of this undertaking for the economic freedom of a landlocked continent.

EARL COOLEY,

President of the Senate.

ROY A. DAVIS,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved March 24, 1921, 2 p. m.

OLIVER H. SHOUP,

Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 24th day of March, A. D. 1921, at 3.35 o'clock p. m.

CARL S. MILLIKEN,

Secretary of State.

By CHAS. M. ARMSTRONG,

Deputy.

ALEXANDER FEES,

Filing Clerk.

Mr. CAPPER presented telegrams in the nature of petitions of the American Association for Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Ogdenburg, and sundry citizens of Riley County; Commodore Barry Council, Knights of Columbus (1,000 members, representing 2,500 people), of Pittsburg; and Robert Emmett Council, American Association for Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Pittsburg, all in the State of Kansas, praying that the republic of Ireland be recognized by this Government, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Women's University Club, of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of maternity and infancy, and also to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.